

THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE



Bulletin

Vol. XLIV, No. 1144

May 29, 1961

**NORTH ATLANTIC COUNCIL HOLDS MINISTERIAL
MEETING AT OSLO 800**

**THE UNITED STATES AND REVOLUTION •
by Carl T. Rowan 795**

**TRADE AND AID IN THE SIXTIES • by Assistant
Secretary Martin 822**

**ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL PROGRESS FOR EXPAND-
ING TRADE IN THE AMERICAS • by Adolf A. Berle . 818**

**THE MAN WHO WASN'T THERE • by Assistant
Secretary Cleveland 808**

**THE UNITED NATIONS AND THE ROLE OF CITIZEN
ORGANIZATIONS • by Ambassador Adlai E. Stevenson . 804**

For index see inside back cover

THE
OFFICIAL
WEEKLY RECORD
OF
UNITED STATES
FOREIGN POLICY

THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Bulletin

VOL. XLIV, No. 1144 • PUBLICATION 7197

May 29, 1961

The Department of State BULLETIN, a weekly publication issued by the Office of Public Services, Bureau of Public Affairs, provides the public and interested agencies of the Government with information on developments in the field of foreign relations and on the work of the Department of State and the Foreign Service. The BULLETIN includes selected press releases on foreign policy, issued by the White House and the Department, and statements and addresses made by the President and by the Secretary of State and other officers of the Department, as well as special articles on various phases of international affairs and the functions of the Department. Information is included concerning treaties and international agreements to which the United States is or may become a party and treaties of general international interest.

Publications of the Department, United Nations documents, and legislative material in the field of international relations are listed currently.

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents
U.S. Government Printing Office
Washington 25, D.C.

PRICE:
52 issues, domestic \$8.50, foreign \$12.25
Single copy, 25 cents

Use of funds for printing of this publication approved by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget (January 19, 1961).

Note: Contents of this publication are not copyrighted and items contained herein may be reprinted. Citation of the DEPARTMENT OF STATE BULLETIN as the source will be appreciated.

The United States and Revolution

by Carl T. Rowan

Deputy Assistant Secretary for Public Affairs¹

It is with a new sense of pride and urgency that I come tonight to speak to those of you who have had the privilege of being a part of this 12th annual Bernadotte Institute on World Affairs. I feel new pride because I have spoken at this institute before and I have traveled the banquet circuit long enough to know that the biggest compliment you can pay any speaker is to invite him back. Having pointed that out, I feel justified in saying that if I bored you on my first appearance I take all blame, but on this second time around—well, you should have learned your lesson the first time.

I feel a new sense of urgency because for 2½ months now I have been in the State Department, literally trapped in the maze of problems, frustrations, confusions, and hopes and fears that have become a part of our dealings with the other nations of the world. As a result I have seen more clearly than I ever could have as a newspaperman-private citizen the dimensions of the challenge to human liberty that hovers over our world; I have come to understand the imperative need of people like you to be informed as to the difficult task that you shall be asked to perform in the name of patriotism, in the very name of human freedom, in the months and years immediately ahead.

My scant knowledge of history tells me that people rarely sacrifice out of ignorance. In our case the challenge is great, the future full of peril, so sacrifice we Americans must. That is why I am so pleased that Gustavus Adolphus continues to take leadership in enlightening Americans to

the point where they can contribute to the establishment of the peaceful world community that was the dream-to-death of Count Folke Bernadotte and is the dream today of the men who lead our Nation.

Without any attempt to be melodramatic let me assure you in this audience that the years ahead will be extremely painful to the squeamish, and I rather feel that under these circumstances ignorance will provide very little bliss. I suppose it strikes some of you as strange that a State Department official, particularly one in an information branch, should talk to you about your need to be fully informed. I expect that some of you are so sure that our primary function is to keep information from the public that you are watching eagerly to see how many bureaucratic wraps they have been able to drape around me in the few weeks I have been in Washington.

A few days ago I telephoned an editor of the *Saturday Evening Post* magazine only to have him pause and ask: "Are you the Carl Rowan who wrote several pieces for our magazine before he sold out to the other side?" I assured him that Government salaries are such that it would be more appropriate to say "who gave over to the other side" but that his basic identification was correct.

We joked and exchanged a few pleasantries and then got on with the business at hand, but I did not lose sight of the real meaning of his opening remark. I knew that here was another individual bothered by at least the latent assumption that the function and desire of Government officials is to withhold information from the public—certainly to disclose as little about Government activities as possible.

¹Address made before the 12th annual Count Folke Bernadotte Institute on World Affairs at Gustavus Adolphus College, St. Peter, Minn., on May 6 (press release 294; as-delivered text).

I shall be candid with you. During these weeks in Washington there have been critical moments when I have wished that we did have some provisions for sweeping information under the rug so as to hide it from that zealous band of newsmen who cover the Nation's Capital. On other occasions I have wished that I possessed the quality of elocution attributed to the late Cordell Hull. The oldtimers say that frequently, in moments of delicate international crises, Mr. Hull would be besieged by the gentlemen of the press. He would expound for perhaps 20 minutes on the problem at hand; then the delighted newsmen would scramble madly for their telephones. A wire service reporter would shout to his headquarters, "I've got a bulletin, I've got a bulletin. Secretary of State Cordell Hull said today—er, er, uh—said today—er, uh. Just a minute, I'll be right back."

I don't know whether it's true or not that, to stay in Washington as long and with as much success as Mr. Hull did, one has to become an expert at talking long while revealing nothing, but I am certain of this: Never before in the Nation's history has the performance of the press been so crucial to the question of the Nation's very survival. What we are seeing in the world today is a dramatic conflict played to a theme about which many of you in this audience must have debated many times: Is a free and open society by its very nature so disadvantaged that it cannot win in mortal combat with a dictatorial, totalitarian regime?

Information Policies and a Free Press

In a recent speech before the American Newspaper Publishers Association, President Kennedy asserted:

Today no war has been declared—and however fierce the struggle may be, it may never be declared in traditional fashion. Our way of life is under attack. Those who make themselves our enemy are advancing around the globe. The survival of our friends is in danger. And yet no war has been declared, no borders have been crossed by marching troops, no missiles have been fired.

If the press is awaiting a declaration of war before it imposes the self-discipline of combat conditions, then I can only say that no war ever posed a greater threat to our security. If you are awaiting a finding of "clear and present danger," then I can only say that the danger has never been more clear and its presence has never been more imminent.

Emphasizing the dilemma we are in, the President pointed to the fact that we are matched

against a regime whose preparations (for conflict) are concealed, not published. Its mistakes are buried, not headlined. Its dissenters are silenced, not lionized. No expenditure is questioned, no rumor is printed, no secret is revealed. It conducts the cold war, in short, with a wartime discipline no democracy would ever hope or wish to match.

Because my every working hour is spent in that world of news leaks, trial balloons, rumor-mongering, and half truths, I know the full import of President Kennedy's remarks. I can say, as did the *New York Times*:

... it is more essential than ever that the people be fully informed of the problems and of the perils confronting them. This is a responsibility as much of the press as of the President. But it is equally essential that the secrets of military technique and—as the President said—of "covert preparations to counter the enemy's covert operations"—be kept inviolate.

But troublesome though our press may be, I want to see it remain free. I believe that to attempt to defeat the Russians by stifling the institutions on which our free society is built would be worse than a Pyrrhic victory, for we shall have given up so much that we shall have fought for nothing. Thus it is my hope that the Government I work for will be so zealous and liberal in its information policies, and the press so sincere in its efforts of self-restraint, that we can maintain the fully informed public that is indispensable to a free society and still permit those who lead our Government to take such steps as are necessary to meet the insidious, vicious assaults upon human freedom that are occurring throughout the world today.

Challenges Before the American People

So tonight let me begin by speaking to you quite candidly about the challenges before the American people as I see them. Let me speak quite openly about what I perceive to be the burdens that make it difficult for us to meet these challenges—burdens which, by their very nature, increase greatly the dangers we face. Let me speak of the responsibilities that no government alone can discharge—responsibilities that will be met only when individuals like you assume that the responsibilities are yours.

I am afraid that few Americans really comprehend the rapidity with which our world is chang-

ing. Who in this audience would have dreamed just 10 years ago that one of the major worries and concerns of Americans today would be a once remote place called Laos? Who among you had any notion that the names to fill today's headlines in newspapers throughout the world would be Kasavubu, Souvanna Phouma, Tshombe, or Kong Le?

The world's major trouble spots—Laos, Cuba, the Congo—are all areas to which most Americans gave little more than passing thought at the end of World War II. But these countries are of vital concern to us today—and not merely because the upheaval that engulfs them poses a political-military threat to the United States and her allies. We of the United States are deeply concerned also because the swift social changes, the awesome advance in man's capacity for self-destruction, have made us acutely aware that what touches part of the human race touches all of mankind.

In our era of almost miraculously advanced technology it is literally true that the cry of a hungry child in Africa or Latin America can be heard by the well-fed in Washington and San Francisco; that the anguish of the enslaved in Hungary or Angola draws compassion from the free in London and New York. Whether we Americans will it so or not, our lives are caught up in this "revolution of rising expectations" that has encompassed almost two-thirds of humanity. This great mass of mankind, groping for more decent standards of living and reaching out for a new measure of dignity, is destined to help determine the kind of world in which you and your children and your children's children will live.

Social and Political Change

Our world is in a period of social and political change as great as any that has occurred in the last 300 years. The old colonial society is crumbling rapidly, and we face the challenge of establishing a new world order that will embrace as equals the many newly independent states that are parading on the world scene. There were just 51 members of the United Nations General Assembly in its first session in 1946; there were 60 at the opening of the 1955 session; today there are 99 member states, and the number probably will reach 120 in a few years.

This brings me to what I consider the fundamental burden of the Western World: We are too

closely identified with the *status quo*. In Asia, Africa, Latin America there are millions who believe that we oppose their revolutions because we are afraid of change. They believe that the wealthy always have opposed change because of a fear that only the *status quo* offers them security.

I know that some Westerners are reluctant to accept today's tumultuous changes. The conflict and disorder that have accompanied the gaining of independence in many areas have induced some Westerners to view the vast revolution in which we live as primarily the product of Communist scheming and skulduggery. I personally am pleased to be in Washington today because I see signs that our leaders are trying to convince the American people that we must free ourselves of such nonsense. One goal of the New Frontier is to make the American people understand that the basic revolution that sweeps Asia, Africa, and even our own hemisphere would have occurred had Karl Marx never been born. We ought to know, and we must insure that the whole world knows, that Americans like Washington, Paine, Paul Revere, blazed the trail of revolutions for independence. We sowed the seeds that produced the harvest of political liberty, human dignity, and material abundance that has caught the imagination of much of the world. The hungry and harassed of many lands are groping for what is a part of our own heritage, and we must leave no one with the false notion that we fear or seek to disown the ideas and aspirations that have sustained us as a nation of free men.

We must make it clear that we do not attempt to thwart the forces of social, economic, and political change, for in a world of progress the *status quo* is good enough for very few people. Human beings emerging from misery, squalor, and political oppression demand change above all else. Let us emphasize that we Americans believe in change, for we were born of it and we have lived and prospered and grown great by it. The *status quo* has never been our god; so let it be clear that we ask no other people to worship it.

Understanding the Basis for Foreign Aid

There is another burden from which our country must free itself if we are to meet the awesome challenges before us: That burden is the persistent notion, held by many powerful and influential people,

that compassion is crime, that our foreign aid programs are mere doles given in the futile effort to help weaklings who prefer to remain weak.

It seems to me that one of the finest things characterizing this Nation today is its understanding that people struggle, sacrifice, fight only when they know and approve of the things for which they struggle, sacrifice, and fight.

It was Seneca who said: "A hungry man listens not to reason, nor cares for justice, nor is bent by any prayers." Official Washington today is inspired by the wisdom of Seneca. I believe that my colleagues of the New Frontier know that it is no protection for liberty and justice merely to give a hungry Latino a lecture and a rifle and admonish him to be brave. Thus we have a Food-for-Peace Program. Thus the President has called for an *Alianza para Progreso*—an Alliance for Progress—a bold program to achieve the social, economic, and political reforms that will permit the average Latin American to struggle because the new hope in his heart and the new happiness in his home tell him that assume responsibility he must, else he renounces all claim to manhood and to dignity.

We all know, of course, that we are not rich enough or strong enough or wise enough to do all these things alone. Thus we have exhorted our Western allies, many of whom we have helped back to positions of abundance, to join us in this campaign to provide for others what we wish for ourselves—that is, freedom from the scourge of illness, ignorance, and hunger and the freedom to know the self-respect of men who control their own destinies. We are asking our fellow Westerners to understand that a world in which two-thirds of the human beings suffer either from undernutrition or malnutrition can never be a very happy world—nor a very safe one.

Equally important, I think, is this administration's belief that at this stage of world history we dare not speak of what we shall do to or for Latin America, Asia, or Africa. Our concern must be about what we shall do *with* the peoples of these areas. So we speak of an *alianza*, of partnership, for we do not intend ever to lose sight of the fact that inevitably the peoples of the areas involved must be masters—and servants—of their own fates.

We shall be guided by the wisdom of Kahlil Gibran's *The Prophet*, who said:

. . . Life is indeed darkness,
Save when there is urge,
And all urge is blind,
Save when there is knowledge,
And all knowledge is vain,
Save when there is work. . . .

It is my hope that our programs of economic assistance will inspire the urge for freedom, that the sharing of our technical know-how will permit freedom to be sustained by knowledge, and that knowledge will be utilized through the hard work of peoples buoyed up in burgeoning hope, peoples caught up in their own industrial and social revolutions.

But all the hope and farsightedness that I see in the Kennedy administration can go for naught if the people remain lethargic, if the Congress and the "common man" fail to sense the spirit and the demand of our time. A President can set forth a nation's declaration of integrity, but only the people can breathe life into it.

There are two ways in which the people of America can render meaningless all the boldness and imagination that can be conjured up in Washington:

1. They can be swayed by visionless and sometimes overly ambitious politicians and commentators who continue to speak from doubt and arrogance in their opposition to all programs of economic assistance.

2. They can show Americans to be incapable of responding to the lofty ideals of justice and compassion, with the result that we Americans will share our blessings begrudgingly—that the little we give will be offered only as a measure of our hatred and our fear.

Now let me speak plainly. There are many Americans—in this community and all others—who have not been able to reconcile themselves to our foreign aid programs. Nobody wants to admit to greed these days; so a great many have resorted to homespun psychology and penthouse philosophy to justify their opposition. "Charity begins at home," they will say, as if it is compassion for the hungry among our aged, or on our reservations, or in our city slums, that leads them to oppose sending gifts abroad. The trouble is, of course, that I never see the critics of our foreign aid programs bearing any great gifts to our needy

at home either. The opponents also will tell you that it is wrong to give "handouts" to the peasants of Latin America because "doles rob people of their initiative." They tell us how you "can't buy friendship" and how inevitably "the man who accepts charity winds up hating the giver." Recently I have listened to lengthy lectures from people who say they are convinced that "all the Communists are waiting for is for us to give away so much that our economy will collapse, and then they will have us under their heel." (Just in case this argument bothers you, let me point out that Communist-bloc countries handed out a mere \$11 million in economic aid in 1954; in 1960 they made economic aid commitments totaling \$1,165 million, or a 10,000 percent increase in 6 years. It seems obvious to me that, if supporting a program of foreign aid leads a country to economic ruin, the Communists have leaped from the space race to a contest to see who can be first to reach economic collapse.)

Finally, the curbstone anthropologists say they oppose foreign aid because it's a waste of time trying to produce meaningful economic, social, and political progress in Asia, Africa, and Latin America because the peoples of these lands just don't have what it takes to produce the kind of material abundance and political maturity that the Western World has enjoyed for the last several decades.

This latter bit of arrogance I shall not bother to respond to before so enlightened an audience as this. Let me say simply that you must ask yourselves in what ways you can help more Americans to understand that our foreign aid program is not designed to win friends and influence people—that it is based on the fundamental belief that a world in which relatively few people enjoy an excess of the necessities of life and the great mass of humanity live in misery and squalor is never going to be a very peaceful world. Our whole future is bound up in the question of how soon we can get more Americans to accept this present-day fact of life.

Reliance on Morality and Justice

Now what about my second fear? What do I mean when I speak of our inability to respond to lofty ideals? I mean simply that for much too

long we Americans have been "selling" our aid programs, our campaigns for social justice within the United States, our posture in the United Nations, and Heaven knows what else, on the grounds that such things are necessary because of the Communist threat, because of what the Communists are doing.

I have had the good fortune to travel extensively in Asia and Africa, and I am under no illusions about the magnitude and the nature of the Communist conspiracy. In terms of the total world ideological struggle, we face an adversary of great power, of considerable and growing wealth, and most of all of remarkable propaganda skills. While we have appeared to have our wagon hitched to the *status quo*, the leaders of world communism have managed cleverly to hitch their Red Star to the crest of the wave of nationalism.

I know that the metaphor would never get me through anybody's English class, but I think you get what I mean.

Yet, recognizing the threat of Sino-Soviet imperialism, it seems to me manifestly clear that we cannot defeat the Communists by outthating them. We cannot defeat the Communists by adopting tactics of totalitarianism, by allowing ourselves to be caught up in the suspicions that turn neighbor against neighbor and make national unity impossible. Our fundamental long-range advantage must lie in the fact that there are moral, ethical, and political factors which clearly distinguish our society from those of the totalitarian world. It is within this area of difference that the peoples of the world must make their choice; so when we resort to the hatred and fear that would destroy these distinguishing moral and ethical factors in our society we shall have defeated ourselves, for we shall have left the world's people no room for choice.

So let us move with boldness away from these negative programs based on hatred and fear. Let us make it clear that we share our wealth not because we fear Khrushchev and Mao but because we hate poverty and human despair; that we have a Food-for-Peace Program not because we hate communism but because we love humanity—because the very nature of our society makes it impossible for us to turn our backs in callousness

when children cry in hunger or die of avoidable afflictions.

We must do these things in the conviction that, while military strength is essential and may indeed maintain the balance that protects us all from atomic holocaust, the final determination as to the kind of world in which our progeny will live will be based on concepts of morality, decency, and justice.

What are we doing to assert our reliance on morality and justice? We are attaching a new kind of "strings" to our programs of economic assistance. We are buying no votes, demanding no political loyalties; the "strings" are simply a demand for assurances that our efforts are matched by the efforts of those being helped—and that the help goes to those who need it.

We are showing the courage to overlook short-range expediency and vote our consciences in the United Nations, even when our stand irritates longtime allies. You have noted, I am sure, that our U.N. votes on Angola² and South-West Africa³ have been played up as our "new policy" on colonialism. We do not regard this as new policy in the strictest sense but only a forthright reaffirmation of the American belief in self-determination. Others have spoken of these votes as examples of the United States "choosing between our European allies and the new states of Asia and Africa." The suggestion is both silly and cynical, for our choice is and must be between right and wrong, justice and injustice, morality and immorality. When we choose justice, morality, rightness, it is a special favor for neither Europe, the new nations, nor even ourselves; it is a choice for all mankind.

In closing, let me say that I am under no illusions about the ease of the tasks before us—either at home or abroad. We and all who love liberty are in for a long struggle, a struggle in which neither angry threats, idealistic speeches, nor wishful thinking will avail us much. Political liberty and social justice can be preserved and extended only through our hard work, our wise concern, our sacrifice—and most of all our conviction to pursue a course whose fundamental justification is its rightness.

I have said much about the imperative need for speedy economic and social progress in these many

troubled and not-yet-troubled lands. This, I believe, is at the heart of our dreams for tomorrow's world. Our goal is to help build not only dams and steel mills but especially to help people—people, the greatest resource of any free society. We of the United States and our prosperous friends must make a decision that the job of producing "growth for progress" in these new nations is worth doing—and that it is worth doing right.

So let us make the next 10 years a "decade of development" for those who yearn for progress. Let us carry into the effort not only our dollars and our know-how but that special "gleam in America's eye." Perhaps the world will see that it is not a leer of avarice or ambition but a gleam of love, compassion, humanitarianism. This is possible, however, only if that gleam in our eye is a glow put there by freedom—freedom for all Americans.

North Atlantic Council Holds Ministerial Meeting at Oslo

The North Atlantic Council held its spring ministerial meeting at Oslo, Norway, May 8-10. Following are texts of a statement made by Secretary Rusk upon his arrival at Oslo on May 6 and a communique issued at the conclusion of the meeting on May 10, together with a list of the principal members of the U.S. delegation.

SECRETARY RUSK'S ARRIVAL STATEMENT

I want to express my appreciation to the Government and the people of Norway for the invitation to hold the 27th ministerial meeting of the North Atlantic Council in this ancient and gracious city. I look forward to meeting with my NATO colleagues and our Norwegian hosts. The development of the Atlantic Community is a foundation of United States foreign policy. It is only through the unified strength of that Community that together we can maintain a world environment in which free societies can flourish. Separately and alone none of us could meet the great challenges of our time.

In the next few days we shall focus primarily on the international political scene and on the non-military aspect of the internal development of the NATO alliance. However, we should not forget

² For background, see BULLETIN of Apr. 3, 1961, p. 497.

³ For background, see *ibid.*, Apr. 17, 1961, p. 569.

that in a world threatened by tyranny our efforts rest on our joint will and ability to defend our freedom by force if necessary.

I hope that our deliberation during the next few days will aid in the continuous process of achieving the common outlook on world problems which is vital to the development of the Atlantic Community and indeed to peace everywhere.

TEXT OF COMMUNIQUE

Press release 307 dated May 10

1. The North Atlantic Council held its Spring Ministerial Meeting in Oslo from May 8th to May 10th, 1961, under the Chairmanship of its new Secretary General, Mr. D. U. Stikker.

2. Since the Atlantic countries united twelve years ago, in accordance with the United Nations Charter, to ensure their common defense, their Alliance has safeguarded peace and freedom. But the menace which drew them together is now not only military but also has world-wide political, economic, scientific and psychological aspects.

3. The North Atlantic Alliance threatens no one. It will never be used for aggression. It seeks to eliminate war and the causes of war. But it is resolved to defend the right of its peoples to live in freedom. In the world as it is today the unity and strength of the Atlantic Alliance is essential to peace and the survival of liberty. Its collective resources—moral and material alike—are fully adequate to this task. Confident in their strength, in the will of their peoples, and in the truth of the ideals they uphold, the fifteen Atlantic Nations dedicate themselves anew to building a world free from the false doctrine of continuing and inevitable conflict.

4. During the meeting the Ministers reviewed developments in the international situation. Aware of the intensified efforts of the Communist bloc to foment and to exploit conflicts and to extend its domination over an ever-increasing area, the Ministers reaffirmed their resolve to meet this challenge.

5. For their part the Atlantic Nations are ready to make their contribution towards achieving an equitable and just settlement of outstanding political questions. They deplore Soviet unwillingness to reciprocate.

6. The Ministers noted with regret the lack of progress on the reunification of Germany. They

reaffirmed their conviction that a peaceful and just solution for the problem of Germany including Berlin is to be found only on the basis of self-determination. With particular regard to Berlin, they reiterated their determination, as expressed in the Declaration of 16th December, 1958,¹ to maintain the freedom of West Berlin and its people. As to the often repeated threat by the Soviet Union to sign a separate peace treaty, they reaffirmed the statement in the 1958 Declaration that "the denunciation by the Soviet Union of the Inter-Allied Agreements on Berlin can in no way deprive the other parties of their rights or relieve the Soviet Union of its obligations."

7. Disarmament by stages under effective international control remains one of the principal objectives of the governments of the Alliance. The Council expressed the hope that the initiation by the U.S.A. of consultations with the U.S.S.R. for the purpose of arriving at a mutually acceptable procedure will permit the resumption of negotiations about the end of July. They agreed that the position of those members of the Alliance participating in the disarmament discussions will be developed in close consultations in the North Atlantic Council.

8. With regard to the Geneva negotiations on the suspension of nuclear tests, the Council noted with approval that the U.S.A. and the U.K. had tabled a comprehensive draft treaty offering a basis for agreement. They regretted that the negative attitude of the Soviet Government has raised new difficulties. They expressed the hope that that government will move promptly to join in an effective treaty as a first and significant step towards disarmament.

9. The task of helping the less-developed areas of the world to raise their social and material standards is one of the major challenges of our time. It is a challenge which the members of the Atlantic Alliance gladly accept; and in their examination of the world situation the Ministers gave high priority to this question. They took note with satisfaction of the large volume of free world aid—dwarfing that granted by the Sino-Soviet bloc—and reaffirmed their determination to increase these efforts.

10. The Ministers discussed the problems of long-term planning within the Alliance in the non-

¹ For text, see BULLETIN of Jan. 5, 1959, p. 4.

military sphere on the basis of a report presented by the Council in permanent session, dealing with the future development and role of the Alliance in the political, economic, civil emergency planning and other fields. Proceeding from this report they gave guidance to the Permanent Council for strengthening the cohesion of the Alliance. The Council recognized that much progress had been made in developing an increased unity of purpose and harmonization of action by its members. It emphasized the importance for this purpose of close, constant and frank consultation in order to make effective the growing unity of the Atlantic Alliance.

11. The Ministers invited the Council in permanent session, in close cooperation with the military authorities, to continue its studies of all aspects of the military posture of the Alliance, with a view to improving its deterrent and defensive strength. They requested the Council to submit these studies when ready and to report to the Ministerial Meeting in December.

12. The Ministers gave special attention to the economic problems affecting Greece and Turkey. Bearing in mind the important contribution made by these two countries to the common defense, they considered ways and means of assisting efforts being made by Greece and Turkey to speed up development programs and improve the living standards of their peoples.

U.S. DELEGATION

The Department of State announced on May 2 (press release 279) that Secretary Rusk would head the U.S. delegation to the 27th ministerial meeting of the North Atlantic Council, held at Oslo, May 8 to 10.

Principal members of the delegation were:

Thomas K. Finletter, U.S. Permanent Representative to the North Atlantic Council
Clifton R. Wharton, Ambassador to Norway
Foy D. Kohler, Assistant Secretary of State for European Affairs
George C. McGhee, Counselor and Chairman of the Policy Planning Council, Department of State
Paul H. Nitze, Assistant Secretary of Defense for International Security Affairs
Raymond L. Thurston, Deputy U.S. Representative to the North Atlantic Council (designate)
Roger W. Tubby, Assistant Secretary of State for Public Affairs

Letters of Credence

Guinea

The newly appointed Ambassador of the Republic of Guinea, Seydou Conté, presented his credentials to President Kennedy on May 10. For texts of the Ambassador's remarks and the President's reply, see Department of State press release 305 dated May 10.

United States Sends Greetings to African Conference at Monrovia

White House press release dated May 8

Following is the text of a message from President Kennedy to President William V.S. Tubman of Liberia on the occasion of the Conference of African States, which convened at Monrovia on May 8.

MAY 8, 1961

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I want to extend to you and to the delegates to the Monrovia Conference the best wishes of the Government and the people of the United States for the success of your conference.

When the leaders of the African nations meet together to discuss the freedom, the security and the economic well-being of their people, all friends of Africa rejoice. We greatly applaud the determination of African leaders to come to grips with their own problems. They are African problems and they must be solved, first of all, in African terms. Solutions thus arrived at advance not only the interest of the African peoples; they contribute also to international understanding and world peace.

The United States of America welcomes African moves toward greater regional or continent-wide cooperation. It strongly hopes for the success of African arrangements designed to keep the peace in Africa, which can serve as an inspiration for other parts of the world community.

It is our further hope that your conference, through discussion of economic and social problems of the African peoples, may arrive at understandings and decisions which will promote economic growth. I assure you that the United States is anxious to assist in promoting that

growth because of our conviction that no nation in the world today can live in peace and prosperity while others are denied the full realization of social progress and human dignity.

To you, your fellow Chiefs of State, and the Foreign Ministers and other representatives at the Monrovia Conference, I express in my own name and in the name of the American people our most sincere hope that this Conference will achieve a full measure of practical success, contributing thereby to the further strengthening of freedom in Africa and throughout the world.

JOHN F. KENNEDY

His Excellency

WILLIAM V. S. TUBMAN,
President of the Republic of Liberia
Monrovia

Governor of Taiwan Visits U.S.

Press release 304 dated May 10

Governor Chou Chi-jou of the Province of Taiwan of the Republic of China is scheduled to arrive on May 10 at Honolulu to begin a 2-month visit in the United States at the invitation of the Department of State. Governor Chou is the chief official responsible for the administration of the Province of Taiwan. He will travel to various parts of the United States and have the opportunity to become acquainted with the American people and their institutions. The Governor is particularly interested in observing the functioning of State governments and in visiting institutions of higher education in this country.

While in Hawaii, Governor Chou will confer with Government officials and visit the recently established Center for Cultural and Technical Interchange Between East and West at the University of Hawaii, as well as visit local industries. He will travel to San Francisco and Los Angeles before flying to Washington, D.C., on May 17. While in the Nation's Capital, he will have the opportunity to observe the Congress in session, visit various departments of the Federal Government, and meet with congressional leaders and Government officials. Governor Chou plans to visit a number of State capitals including Boston and

Albany. During his stay in New York City, he will visit the United Nations and Columbia University. The Governor is scheduled to return to Washington to attend a conference of the International Union of Local Authorities June 25-30. Other plans include visits to Chicago, Detroit, Pittsburgh, and Houston. Further details of his itinerary are presently being arranged. Governor Chou will complete his U.S. visit in mid-July.

President Kennedy Congratulates New Prime Minister of Belgium

White House press release dated May 6

The White House on May 6 made public the following message from President Kennedy to Theo Lefevre, Prime Minister of Belgium.

MAY 6, 1961

DEAR MR. PRIME MINISTER: Although there is a long tradition of friendship and cooperation between the United States and Belgium, today's pressing need for free-world solidarity calls for ever-closer ties between our two countries. I am convinced that through our common efforts the partnership which the United States and Belgium have built over the years will continue to serve not only the best interests of our two countries, but the cause of free men everywhere. I have asked Ambassador MacArthur, in whom I place full confidence, to devote his energies to these ends. I am confident that full and frank discussion of common problems, even where we might have certain differences, will strengthen mutual understanding and thus also serve to strengthen the partnership between our two countries. I would like you to know that for our part we will greatly value your views on all matters of mutual interest.

My fellow Americans join me in extending to you congratulations and best wishes on your assumption of the office of Prime Minister.

Sincerely,

JOHN F. KENNEDY

His Excellency

THEO LEFEVRE,
Prime Minister of Belgium.

The United Nations and the Role of Citizen Organizations

by Adlai E. Stevenson

U.S. Representative to the United Nations¹

Let me begin by congratulating the Conference Group and its able leaders. Both your outgoing chairman, Mrs. [Marion] McVitty, and your new chairman, Dr. [Kenneth] Maxwell, are typical of the high order of ability which has made the Conference Group an effective institution—and one from which much can be hoped in the future.

I must say also, in this gathering, that I feel great respect for you, the leaders of citizen organizations, who for as long as 15 years have felt strongly enough about the value of the United Nations to keep an observer here and thus to keep in touch with the Organization and with your own United States Mission.

Above all I share with many of you feelings of hope—hope for the United Nations, despite all its present difficulties, and for our country's role in it. And I cherish also a hope which is especially relevant to our meeting here this evening—a hope for a future of fruitful cooperation between the United States Mission to the United Nations and leaders like yourselves, who speak for the interested citizen organizations of this country. There is room for improvement in that respect, and I fully intend that we shall improve!

I have more to say on this subject of our future relations with you, but perhaps I should preface it with a few reflections about the institution which is our common concern here, the United Nations.

Like a number of you I have been connected with the United Nations since its founding in San Francisco. I was quite active in it during its first

2 years, first as a planner and then as a delegate. But then, when I wasn't looking one day, I got diverted into other pursuits, as some of you may remember, and the result is that I saw very little of the United Nations for a long period.

So when President Kennedy asked me to take on my present assignment, it was really a homecoming for me. I must confess that I found it hard to recognize the old place! The family I left so many years ago has grown to nearly twice its size. And as usually happens in large families, some of the newer members are making quite a splash, while some of the oldtimers are saying the place "ain't what it used to be."

For my own part I am far from complacent, but neither am I gloomy.

There are certainly elements of real danger in the present situation. Some new members—and some old ones as well—seem chiefly preoccupied with the urgent concerns of their own countries and therefore give little attention to the well-being of the community as a whole. At the same moment the Soviet Union has attacked the United Nations, has refused to pay its share of the Congo expenses, and has laid siege to the institution of the Secretary-General. Thus, as often before, the Soviets have pressed their attack at a moment when the community seems most divided against itself. But, once again, that very attack makes the members realize more keenly that they are members of a community and causes them to draw together.

The General Assembly session just adjourned exhibited all these tendencies. I think it also showed that the United Nations is able to stand the strain and that the United States is still able to find common ground here with the majority of members.

¹ Address made before the Conference Group of the United States National Organizations on the United Nations at New York, N.Y., on May 2 (U.S./U.N. press release 3717).

Issues Before 15th General Assembly

Let me just recall some of the issues.

First, there were the explosive questions of colonial and racial conflict—South Africa,² South-West Africa,³ and Angola.⁴ In each of these cases the United States stood clearly for the peoples whose rights were at stake—a fact that was noted and appreciated.

Second, we made a useful beginning in the debate on the United States proposal for a United Nations development program in Africa.⁵ It is a big subject with many complexities, political as well as economic, but it will be considered again in the fall and, I believe, holds great promise.

Third, the Assembly continued to support the United Nations operation in the Congo in spite of a new round of violent verbal offensives led by Mr. [Valerian A.] Zorin of the Soviet Union; and I may say that the prospects for a peaceful solution to the Congo's troubles look better now than for a long time past, though we are far from being out of the woods.⁶

Fourth, on the vitally important question of financing the Congo operation, the Assembly adopted an interim resolution⁷ which will at least tide the United Nations over until this fall. I think members are gradually realizing that a failure on this one question of financing could be fatal to the United Nations. We intend to confer actively with other members on this subject between now and September.

Finally, it is noteworthy that the Soviet attempt to replace the Secretary-General with a triumvirate, which means a built-in veto, was so unsuccessful that the Soviet Union did not even introduce a formal proposal on the subject. Once, when they approached the subject obliquely by proposing to remove a reference to the Secretary-General from a resolution on the Congo, they lost by the overwhelming margin of 83 to 11.

Perhaps I ought to add, to give due credit to the Soviet Union, that Mr. [Andrei A.] Gromyko and

I worked out an agreement to refrain from a debate on disarmament at this session.⁸ That was a considerable achievement of a negative sort, because public debate at this moment would certainly not have brought a disarmament agreement any nearer. Let us hope that when the negotiations begin this summer the Soviets will be in a cooperative mood.

The United Nations now numbers 99 member states, nearly half of which are nations of Africa and Asia—most of them newer in their independence than the United Nations itself. It is the most influential international body ever known: the greatest hope for the just and peaceful settlement of disputes and for the defeat of aggression. It is a place from which nations in need of economic or technical help can get it without being subjected to subversion, foreign control, or involvement in the cold war. And it is a source of guidance and influence in the great transition which this generation is witnessing, from the colonial age to the age of self-government and national independence.

Anyone who doubts the potent, if at times intangible, force of the United Nations should consider the eagerness of all nations, even Communist nations, to join an institution which is and will continue to be managed predominantly by its non-Communist members.

When a young state wants to symbolize its new nationhood, its leaders come to the United Nations.

When a nation wants to complain of discrimination by its neighbors, of border raids or outright invasion, its leaders dramatize the issue before the United Nations.

When a country seeks expert advice on how to develop its economy, or wants to borrow able foreign administrators to help man its new government, it turns to the United Nations.

When a certain prime minister wants to bang his shoe on the table—and wants the bang to be heard round the world—he, too, comes to the United Nations.

Yes, the United Nations is larger and more universal than ever. No man, no group of men, no nation can afford to disregard it.

The United Nations clearly reflects the realities of the world in which we live. It is a sensitive measure of the tremors which shake the community of nations—tremors which in the postwar years have threatened to topple some of our more

² BULLETIN of Apr. 24, 1961, p. 600.

³ *Ibid.*, Apr. 17, 1961, p. 569.

⁴ *Ibid.*, Apr. 3, 1961, p. 497.

⁵ *Ibid.*, Apr. 10, 1961, p. 534.

⁶ *Ibid.*, May 22, 1961, p. 781.

⁷ U.N. doc. A/RES/1619 (XV). For a statement made on Apr. 18 by Philip M. Klutznick, U.S. Representative to the General Assembly, during debate in Committee I, see U.S. delegation press release 3700.

⁸ BULLETIN of Apr. 17, 1961, p. 568.

vulnerable towers. But we are not helpless. The tremors are manmade, and man can still them. To that end nations must work together within a framework of common purposes, transcending their particular ambitions.

Such a framework exists, the only framework commonly subscribed to by the nations of nearly all the world—the United Nations Charter. In its preamble are expressed the common yearnings of all men and women to achieve freedom from war, poverty, disease, ignorance, oppression, and intolerance. Those are the instincts which bind us together.

Yet only the determined concord of the preponderant majority of states, both large and small, can redeem the promises of the charter. It is not enough that each member be legally bound by the charter. We must so conduct ourselves that the charter remains a powerful and lively instrument, whose principles the nations are eager to defend in dark days as well as bright, to make sacrifices for, to pay for, to run risks for, and to apply to the particular circumstances of the time.

Applying the Principles of the United Nations

Let us think for a moment about the particular circumstances of *this* time and how we can apply to it the principles of the United Nations.

Our greatest new preoccupation in the United Nations must be with the many new and emerging nations which have taken their places here, or will do so in a few years' time. In every fundamental sense their interest is also ours—in the search for peace, for economic development, for dignity and self-respect, for the eradication of racial prejudice. We seek no military allies among them, nor do we wish to impose our system or our philosophy on them; indeed we cannot, since freedom cannot be imposed on anyone.

Those common interests have been obscured by various crosscurrents which Moscow has done its best to strengthen. But I believe our friendships with the peoples of Africa are well begun and have a great future. They require, like all friendships, that we be patient and that we be not just fast talkers but good listeners.

They require also that we give due attention to the promotion of equal justice among Americans of all races, for what we do at home in that connection is reported all over the world. Finally,

it is necessary that the United States should continue to speak and vote in the United Nations for political and economic and social progress for the peoples of Africa. No nation should have reason to feel that, although it is ready to help itself toward political and economic progress and to make all the necessary strenuous efforts in its own behalf, it has been let down by the community of nations.

A second point is that, in this great transition from the colonial age, conflicts are inevitable. There are conflicts between emerging nations, and others between the old ruler and the emerging colony. The United States, and indeed the whole United Nations, must pursue the aims of the charter with the least possible encouragement to those who, for whatever reasons, are intent on stirring up conflict and setting one region or one race or one nation against another. In particular the investment capital and technical knowledge of Europe are vitally important to the emerging nations. The United Nations must be able to help and maintain bridges of mutual confidence over which those vital resources can flow. This is one case where fidelity to the charter's advice, "to practice tolerance," is a practical necessity.

Another circumstance is that the United Nations itself, as an institution, is under a good deal of strain. The Secretary-General and his staff are under heavy Soviet attack. The Soviet bloc and some other members have refused to pay for the Congo operation because they do not approve of what is being done there.

Finally, it is a circumstance of the United Nations that there are now over 90 members with full-time permanent missions in the New York area. Among these are the missions of the new nations of Africa. There will be more coming in the years ahead. For the United States, as the host country, and for the American people, this circumstance means a unique responsibility and a great opportunity. There have, perhaps inevitably, been a few unfortunate incidents of which we as Americans cannot be proud. But I am glad to say that there have also been many excellent, imaginative, cordial acts of hospitality and friendliness by American citizens which have done much to make our friends from abroad feel welcome here. I believe a number of you in this gathering this evening have had a share in these activities.

Those are some of our difficulties and opportuni-

ties right now in the United Nations. We are like a ship which is in a rather narrow and difficult passage. To get the ship through is going to require the best efforts not only of us who are, so to speak, members of the crew but also of you who are on the shore and are—I hope—cheering us on.

Role of Nongovernmental Organizations

So I should like to talk to you, before I close, about what you as leaders and representatives of American organizations may be able to do in this enterprise, which I believe interests you as much as it does me.

Through your observers here, your leaders and members can study the day-to-day events in the United Nations not only on the specialized subjects which concern some of you but also on the great questions of polity and comity among nations. And, having obtained your facts from the source, you can then form worthwhile opinions.

You have a job of opinion leadership to do not only within your organizations but in the country at large—through publications, conferences, and personal contact. You and your organizations are important centers of influence.

You can continue to give us in the United States Mission your considered views—and I know you will. We are never shocked to find that somebody disagrees with us, and we are happy always to receive ideas, suggestions, and even protests.

Also, quite aside from informing the people and advising the Government, there are realms in which your direct action is often most useful. I understand that some of you have been interested in locating recruits for United Nations programs. Some of you have contributed materially to United States reports to the United Nations, especially in the field of human rights. These things should continue; and, in addition, you can do most valuable work in the field of United Nations hospitality which I mentioned a moment ago.

Let me say how pleased I was to learn that the Conference Group has recently established a committee on general hospitality which will stimulate and guide the work of your different organizations in this field. You can be sure that the United States Mission will give this committee every possible cooperation.

In fact, as I said at the outset, we intend to improve our cooperation with the whole community

of United States nongovernmental organizations in every respect. I have already discussed this matter with some of my associates. We intend soon to have on the mission staff an officer whose chief duty will be day-to-day relations with the NGO's. The senior members of the mission will do all they can to help, and so shall I—provided you don't expect miracles from me, that is.

We shall confer often, not only in plenary sessions such as this but also from time to time in smaller groups interested in particular topics. And we shall hope that visits of your national leaders to the United Nations, like this meeting this evening and the conference tomorrow, will become a regular affair.

From all this you may conclude that I expect you, as NGO's, to earn your passage in this voyage we are making together. Indeed I do. We have common interests and common goals, and whatever our particular differences of opinion may be, there is every reason for us to talk and work together.

And certainly we shall work together on more than just the urgent political issues which always seem to grab the headlines. You NGO's are a great asset partly because you *do* read beyond the headlines and you *do* understand the difference between what is merely urgent and what is really important.

Many of you know, for instance, that there is in the United Nations a body called the Social Commission and that in that little-known forum my good friend and colleague Mrs. Jane Dick, speaking for the United States, presented only 2 weeks ago a new approach to the deep social evils which afflict humanity in our time.⁹ She spoke of the absolute necessity of better education and better health if the great programs of economic development we talk about are ever to be realized. She spoke of the vital importance of family stability and the tragic losses to society in the uprooting of rural youth who turn to delinquency in the cities. She stressed that obvious but much neglected truth that "wise social change" is a necessity for economic growth.

You who know something about the United Nations remember the call in the preamble to the

⁹ For text, see U.S./U.N. press release 3698 dated Apr. 17.

charter for economic and social progress "in larger freedom." Somehow we have recently been putting most of the accent on *economic* progress, and it is time to redress the balance by doing something about *social* progress as well.

The same thing holds true in the Commission on Human Rights, where Marietta Tree is our representative, following in the famous footsteps of Mrs. Roosevelt. You who are NGO observers know the great significance of this work and what it has already meant in helping peoples all over the world to grasp the true meaning—the sometimes elusive meaning—of freedom.

These, of course, are the activities which are truly important. They reach to the foundations of life. Without them the idea of a community of nations would be barren. We rely on you to follow them, to understand them, and not to let public opinion forget about them.

Let me end with this one thought. To anybody who represents the United States in international affairs, with all our national faults and virtues

open to public scrutiny, the vigor and public spirit and creativeness of our citizen organizations—our NGO's—is a great source of pride. Most of us, as Americans, take this for granted, so that for me in my position to be meeting with you here this evening is the most natural and proper thing in the world.

Our country's history is full of the contributions made in times of crisis by the churches, the fraternal organizations, the labor unions, the "uplift" societies of all kinds which the cynics love to make fun of. Yet to many visitors from foreign countries all this American ferment of activity, this free interplay of influence and leadership throughout our national society, is a wonder to behold.

And since in this generation we are engaged in a many-sided struggle which will decide the meaning of freedom for generations to come, it seems entirely fitting to me that organizations like yours, whose very being is an expression of freedom, should be with us in that struggle as advisers, critics, collaborators, and friends.

The Man Who Wasn't There

by Harlan Cleveland

*Assistant Secretary for International Organization Affairs*¹

Baseball players, prizefighters, actresses, country singers, insurance salesmen, skindivers, and clergymen all welcome public interest in their professional problems. Lawyers seldom do. International lawyers have not had enough precedents to guide them.

Yet during the 15th General Assembly of the United Nations the fancy of the public and the solicitude of the international lawyer coincided. They coincided on the Secretary-General of the United Nations, the man and the office.

Dag Hammarskjöld became at one and the same time a television hero and the central target

of the most determined assault against the United Nations by a member state since the Soviet Union recalled its delegates in 1950, when the Security Council refused to seat representatives of Communist China.

Without question the Soviet assault on Dag Hammarskjöld was the major issue of this session. It was more than that. It was an admission by the Soviet Union that the United Nations had begun to "take"—that between heaven and earth there was a new force, undreamt of in the Communist philosophy. The reaction was incomplete and ineffective. As events in the Congo were recorded in the radio room of the *Baltica* as it steamed to the East River, Premier Khrushchev might have thought of the lines:

¹ Address made before the American Society of International Law at Washington, D.C., on Apr. 29 (press release 273, revised).

As I was going up the stair
I met a man who wasn't there.
He wasn't there again today.
I wish, I wish he'd stay away.

We can take some comfort in seeing confounded, even in a small way, those who claim to be our enemies. But the game is not over. They have merely been left on base a couple of times. The Soviet reaction to this new force in the world is indicative of how they will play the game in the hard innings ahead.

Some Facts About the United Nations

When the United Nations was created in 1945, it was designed for accommodation among the great powers in an atmosphere of consultation with the smaller ones. Power rested in the Security Council, whose five permanent members could veto any important action. That is what the Soviets wanted and what they fought for at Dumbarton Oaks and at San Francisco. To a large extent it was what the United States wanted. It is clearly in the interests of great powers to deal directly with each other if, in fact, they could. As it turned out, they could not. They needed a good many small powers looking over their shoulders, encouraging them to get together on international operations reflecting their common concerns.

The most notorious consequence of the shift in emphasis to the General Assembly was this curious and wonderful process called parliamentary diplomacy. In a large and growing body of representatives of sovereign nations, none possessed of the veto, the complex devices of parliamentary government became the order of the day. For the most part, however, the debates, the struggle for votes, the sweeping resolutions on the great subjects, have only a symbolic significance. Those who have no patience with this action—or appearance of action—fail to realize that the universal acceptance of parliamentary procedure in itself constitutes a major triumph for the most Western of all institutions.

Contrary to the predictions of some experts, the United Nations did not degenerate into a powerless forum. Rather it evolved some remarkably sophisticated means of influencing world events. The General Assembly acquired a taste for action which the great powers on the Security Council had to recognize. For the United States and the

United Kingdom this was never a serious problem. France has been less than enthusiastic. But for the Soviet Union the cumulative power of the small nations is a serious obstacle, an obstacle both real and doctrinal.

In this context let us look at some facts about the life of the United Nations in the present stage of its evolution.

1. As we all know, the growing importance of the U.N., combined with rigid application of the one-country, one-vote principle, makes for increasing difficulty in mobilizing a two-thirds majority in the Assembly for sensible and moderate programs and policies. The presence of "swirling majorities" in the Assembly in turn raises the emotional temperature of the atmosphere in debates in the smaller councils, notably in the Security Council and the Trusteeship Council but to some extent in the Economic and Social Council as well.

2. However, the General Assembly's resumed session did demonstrate that it remains possible, even in a parliament of 99 sovereign nations with 25 African states in attendance, to keep action (as differentiated from talk) under control. Despite our well-publicized difficulties in New York during the last few weeks, there was literally no action item which was able to get a two-thirds majority in the General Assembly over the opposition of the United States delegation. The Arab bloc could not sell its proposal for an alien property custodian in Palestine. The African states could not win on the issue of "target dates" for non-self-governing territories. The Mexican resolution on Cuba likewise failed to muster a two-thirds vote.²

3. On the other hand, a two-thirds vote was put together for (a) the Latin American resolution on Cuba³ (somewhat watered down, to be sure), (b) the financing of the Congo operation, (c) the exhortations to the Portuguese on Angola⁴ and to the Belgians on Ruanda-Urundi,⁵ (d) the recommendation to admit Mauritania,⁶ (e) the approval and implementation of the plebiscite to split the Cameroon Trust Territory, and (f) several noncontroversial items, including the U.S.—

² For background and texts of resolutions, see *BULLETIN* of May 8, 1961, p. 667.

³ *Ibid.*, Apr. 3, 1961, p. 497.

⁴ *Ibid.*, May 22, 1961, p. 785.

⁵ *Ibid.*, Dec. 26, 1960, p. 976.

U.S.S.R. resolution which deferred General Assembly discussions on disarmament.⁶

4. Thus in the actual event the more irresponsible proposals were defeated and the most necessary actions were taken. The picture is by no means one of swirling majorities under the leadership of the Soviet Union defeating the United States at every turn. The United States is not being defeated at every turn; and the swirling majorities are far from being subject to Soviet leadership. Indeed, the Soviets do not operate in such a way as to exercise the influence they could in this forum, since they take a relatively extreme position on nearly every issue, often change their positions suddenly in the later stages of debate, and have not yet learned to use their financial influence in the U.N. (They could jeopardize the Congo operation far more by participating in its financing and then threatening to withdraw than by boycotting the agreed assessment from the outset.)

5. In the midst of all these stirring parliamentary events highly significant executive operations are going on beneath the surface of the Assembly debates. The U.N. Emergency Force continues to sit on the Gaza Strip. The mediation machinery in the Middle East survives the April 20 Israeli parade in Jerusalem.⁷ Observers and "presences" are keeping alive some issues (like Hungary and South-West Africa⁸) that might otherwise be forgotten by the conscience of the world community. By far most important of all, the U.N. executive has been building its Congo force back up to nearly 20,000, in spite of earlier defections under Soviet pressure. Also during this period the U.N. is managing a sufficient show of firmness to convince the central Congolese government that the best way to avoid having the U.N. mixing in its affairs for the long run is to cooperate with it in the short run. At the same time, unnoticed and unsung, the U.N. Congo staff is conducting in the technical, economic, and financial fields one of the world's largest civilian advisory operations.

⁶ *Ibid.*, Apr. 17, 1961, p. 568.

⁷ For text of a statement made in the Security Council by Deputy U.S. Representative Francis T. P. Plimpton, see *ibid.*, May 1, 1961, p. 649.

⁸ For text of a statement on South-West Africa by U.S. Representative Jonathan B. Bingham, see *ibid.*, Apr. 17, 1961, p. 569.

6. In spite of all the talk about the devastating effects of the Soviet attack on the Secretary-General, that estimable executive clearly won the 1960-61 round in what will doubtless be a continuing fight. Khrushchev came in like a lion with his proposal last fall for a tripartite Secretary-General; [Soviet Foreign Minister Andrei A.] Gromyko ascertained in March that in its present form this proposal was strictly no sale; and [Soviet Representative Valerian A.] Zorin was duly instructed to go out like a lamb in April. The predicted timidity of the Secretariat, as a result of the Soviet attack, has materialized among subordinates to some extent but is not much in evidence in the Secretary-General's office.

These are lessons that can be derived from past experience. If we look now to the future of the United Nations, some additional facts of life are discernible.

7. There is hardly a major subject in international politics which does not have a United Nations angle, presently or prospectively. To put the same thought another way, nearly every major matter handled by every foreign office in the world has to be handled both in bilateral diplomatic channels and in the multilateral channels of international organization.

8. Every United Nations matter (thus, by the definition I have just suggested, nearly every major matter of foreign policy) is sooner or later subjected to the full glare of international publicity. The United Nations has become a world news center rivaling and, on some subjects, upstaging the traditional news centers of London and Washington.

9. The United Nations and other international organizations are developing and can much further develop a capacity to take executive action on behalf of the world community as a whole. The unnoticed lesson of the past few weeks' events is the great potential importance to our national interest of these international operations. The Kennedy administration inherited three prime trouble spots: the Congo, Laos, and Cuba. It is not without meaning that, of these three, we have had to move backward or sideways on Cuba and Laos, where no international field operation has been developed; but in the Congo the presence of a field operation maintained by an international organization has enabled us to move forward (by fits and starts, to be sure) precisely

because the world community can "intervene in the name of nonintervention" while a single nation, however powerful, cannot. The development of the United Nations' operational capability should now be a central target of American foreign policy.

The Soviet Union and the Congo Issue

When the Congo operation was begun by Security Council direction in the summer of 1960, the Soviet Union found its freedom of action severely curtailed by the opinion and pressures of the vast majority of the United Nations. The Soviets' only hope of penetrating the Congo lay in a bold move spearheaded by Communist advisers and diplomats in the Congo. When the large Soviet contingent was expelled from the Congo while Premier Khrushchev was en route to the United Nations headquarters, this hope dwindled fast. The Russians realized that the collective strength of the United Nations constituted a portentous threat to their global plans for indirect aggression. The weak, the poor, the unstable nations of the world had found a means of protecting themselves from competitive intervention by putting the United Nations in business to inject the elements of internal security, economic growth, and political development.

While some of the antics of Premier Khrushchev at the General Assembly are familiar to the parliaments of Eastern Europe, many of them must be ascribed to bafflement and frustration at this realization. The vicious attack on the Secretary-General is standard Communist tactics—but the famous tripartite proposal has an *ad hoc* ring to it that bears further examination.

In a speech before the General Assembly on September 23, Premier Khrushchev formulated his proposals for the tripartite system. He told the Assembly:

We consider it reasonable and just for the executive organ of the United Nations to consist not of a single person—the Secretary-General—but of three persons invested with the highest trust of the United Nations, persons representing the States belonging to the three basic groups I have mentioned. The point at issue is not the title of the organ but that this executive organ should represent the states belonging to the military bloc of the Western Powers, the socialist States and the neutralist States. This composition of the United Nations executive organ would create conditions for a more correct implementation of the decisions taken.

Another passage in the same speech received little attention, but it is most revealing of the Soviet attitude to the United Nations. Premier Khrushchev said:

Experience of the work of the United Nations has shown that this body is useful and necessary, because in it are represented all the States which are called upon to solve, through negotiation and discussion, the pressing issues of international relations so as to prevent them from reaching a point where conflicts and wars might break out. That is the positive aspect of the work of the United Nations. That, indeed, constitutes the main purpose of the creation of the United Nations.

In this passage we have the Soviet definition of collective security. It stops with negotiation and discussion.

As things turned out, the position of the Soviet delegation on the Congo was a most unhappy one. They started by voting in favor of three Security Council resolutions that put the Secretary-General firmly in business, with troops and civilian administrators, in the Congo.⁹ Then in mid-September, after their representatives had been thrown out of Léopoldville and [Patrice] Lumumba had been dismissed as Prime Minister, the Soviets proposed the removal of all U.N. troops from the Congo. In the Security Council they used their veto to stave off a defeat on this proposition. Caught in a vise, they found themselves vetoing a resolution authored by an Asian nation, Ceylon, and an African nation, Tunisia, a resolution that urged the Secretary-General to carry out vigorously the earlier resolutions on the Congo which the Soviet Union had supported.¹⁰

The issue then moved to the General Assembly under the Uniting-for-Peace resolution. Here the Soviets, lacking a veto, were really over a barrel. They didn't want to vote to strengthen the mandate of the Secretary-General, on whom they were about to launch a massive attack. But they also didn't want to vote against the Congo operation for fear of offending the entire body of United Nations members, including the whole Afro-Asian group, which supported it. The final vote in the General Assembly on this crucial issue was 70 in

⁹ For background, see *ibid.*, Aug. 1, 1960, p. 159; Aug. 8, 1960, p. 221; and Sept. 5, 1960, p. 384. NOTE: Footnote 4, *ibid.*, p. 385, is in error. France and Italy, not Poland and the U.S.S.R., abstained from the vote on resolution S/4426 on Aug. 9, 1960.

¹⁰ For background, see *ibid.*, Oct. 3, 1960, p. 527.

favor, none against, and 11 abstentions, mostly the Soviets and their satellites.¹¹

The sequel was played out in the Security Council during the first month of the Kennedy administration.¹² The Secretary-General thought he needed a stronger mandate to deal with the competing political factions in the Congo and to stop the defection of troops from the U.N. Force. In the Security Council debate that followed, Ambassador Adlai Stevenson used his eloquence in support of the Secretary-General, while the Soviet delegation tried to weaken the mandate and undermine the office of Secretary-General into the bargain.

Again the Soviets found themselves in a box. They did not want to strengthen the U.N. mandate, but by converting the Congo debate into a crisis of confidence in the United Nations itself, the Soviets found even their closest collaborators among the Afro-Asians heading for the exits when the Soviet resolution came to a vote. The Secretary-General's new mandate then sailed through the Security Council by a vote of 9 to 0, with the Soviets abstaining—accompanied only by the French, who have consistently abstained from all Congo resolutions from the outset. Only on the narrow issue of the death of Lumumba did the Soviets attract a few nonsatellite votes that night.

Soviet Attack on the Secretary-General

The issue of replacing the Secretary-General went even more poorly. The Soviet threat to withdraw recognition—the “freezeout” they had used on Hammarskjöld's predecessor, Trygve Lie—was not even carried out consistently by the Soviets and their satellites. The reply of the Secretary-General was itself a devastating blow. The Soviet effort was doomed from the start, and the Soviet delegates were defenseless before Hammarskjöld's simple statement:

... much more is at stake than this or that organization of the United Nations. Indeed, the United Nations has never been and will never be more than an instrument for member governments in their effort to pave the way towards orderly and peaceful coexistence. It is not the man, it is not even the institution, it is that very effort that has now come under attack.

Whenever this issue is thus clearly raised, it is

quickly recognized as involving the very existence of the United Nations. Take the most recent effort to undermine the position of the Secretary-General. It came up during the General Assembly debate earlier this month on yet another Congo resolution.¹³ On April 15 Guinea proposed an amendment which would have replaced the words “Secretary-General” with the more general phrase “all authorities concerned.” This crude attack on the immovable body of Dag Hammarskjöld was overwhelmingly rejected by a vote of 83 to 11, with only 5 members of the United Nations abstaining.

It is difficult to determine how much damage the Soviet attack on the Secretary-General has done to their pretension to being protector of the new nations. The point was driven home in President Kennedy's clear pronouncement that the United Nations is vital to the smaller nations.¹⁴ Ambassador Stevenson put it this way in the Security Council:¹⁵

My own country, as it happens, is in the fortunate position of being able to look out for itself and for its interests, and look out it will. But it is for the vast majority of states that the United Nations has vital meaning and is of vital necessity. I call on those states to rise in defense of the integrity of the institution which is for them the only assurance of their freedom and their liberty and the only assurance for all of us of peace in the years to come.

This theme was echoed by nation after nation in the discussion that followed. Few of these comments missed the point that the clear intent of the Soviet proposal was to strip the United Nations of its capacity to act. The following comments are typical:

Burma: In these circumstances my delegation does not see any need at present to modify his office or his functions or to reorganize his Secretariat. Any such course is not only bound to retard the efficiency of the United Nations operations but is sure to weaken the Organization itself.

Canada: The proposal of the Soviet Union to replace the Secretary-General with a three-man presidium requiring unanimous agreement to act is a transparent plan to undermine the prestige and authority of the United Nations. Having thwarted the United Nations so often through the exercise of the veto, the Soviet Union now seems bent on destroying the United Nations by neutralizing its power to proceed effectively and promptly in emergencies as they arise.

Ceylon: The collegium or triumvirate—call it what you

¹¹ For background, see *ibid.*, Oct. 10, 1960, p. 583.

¹² *Ibid.*, Mar. 13, 1961, p. 359.

¹³ *Ibid.*, May 22, 1961, p. 781.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, Feb. 13, 1961, p. 207.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, Mar. 13, 1961, p. 359.

will—composed as suggested, would not, if it is at the same time hamstrung by giving the right of veto to each member, be capable of effective or prompt action or of discharging the responsibilities which, as successor to the Secretary-General, it would be called upon to assume under the charter.

Chile: If we were to have several Secretaries-General we would lose the necessary unity which must prevail in any executive branch, and we should sterilize the office to such a point that agreements and decisions would be left unimplemented for an unduly long time.

Cyprus: It is most essential that the office of the Secretary-General, as the executive organ of the United Nations, should in no way be weakened in its decision or hampered in its action. Any assumption of the authority and functions of the Secretary-General by a political body, however constituted, or any other interpolation in the Secretary-General's duties, would bring the discord of politics into the heart of the executive and would thus paralyze its action and its efficacy at times when it is most needed.

Ecuador: That would mean putting a brake on United Nations action.

Greece: In an organization spread over the whole world and liable to be called upon suddenly to act in any part of our globe, the organs which take the decisions are and should be collective. Delays, often very regrettable, are unavoidable. But if to the collective organs which take the decisions are added collective organs for their execution, then we shall no longer be confronted with regrettable and dangerous delays but with total immobilization. If the proposed changes were made, the executive authority in times of grave crisis, after discussing for a number of days, or even of weeks, the meaning of the decisions taken and the manner of their execution, would have no other functions to perform than to draw up a report on the accomplished facts.

India: Insofar as executive action is concerned, it would not be desirable for the executive to be weakened when frequent and rapid decisions have to be made. That would mean an abdication of the responsibilities undertaken by the United Nations. If the executive itself is split up and pulls in different directions, it will not be able to function adequately or with speed. For that reason the executive should be given authority to act within the terms of the directions issued.

Ireland: We stand firmly in support of the office of the Secretary-General, as the organ of the charter which provides the means of effective implementation of the Organization's decisions.

Israel: We have the Security Council with the veto power on decisions, and we are now asked to create a system of veto power on implementation.

New Zealand: It is even more disquieting to have an alternative proposal put before the Assembly to replace unity by crippling division, decision by indecision, trust by suspicion and uncertainty. It must be clear to those who study the meaning of the charter, and who place their faith in the success of its principles, that the acceptance of the proposal to which I refer could foreshadow

the failure of this Organization as the defender of international peace and security.

Tunisia: To seek to transform the Secretariat into an organ which would also have a type of veto over the decisions of our Organization would without doubt render the actions of the United Nations ineffectual.

El Salvador: This tripartite body that would exist instead of the Secretary-General would only be able to act—and this is Mr. Khrushchev's declared intention—on the basis of unanimity. Thus, the executive organ of the United Nations that is in charge of implementing the decisions of the Council or the General Assembly would thereupon be imbued with the innate and chronic disease that makes the Council itself inoperative—in other words, the veto.

Thailand: With such results now at hand the only logical course of action that remains open to us is to strengthen the office of the Secretary-General as institutionalized in our charter.

Venezuela: Moreover, the establishment of this tripartite body to replace the Secretary-General would prevent the highest administrative body of the United Nations from having any effective action and it would destroy its flexibility.

The response to the Soviet proposal was almost unanimously negative. Nobody laughed, but the Soviet proposal began to look about as ridiculous as the testimony of that

. . . old party of Lyme
Who married three wives at a time
When asked "Why the third?"
He replied "One's absurd.
And bigamy, sir, is a crime!"

Perhaps the Soviet proposal for a tripartite Secretary-General can best be seen for what it is in an analogy suggested by a historian of my acquaintance. In the first half of the 16th century, he suggests, it would have made just about as much sense to suggest setting up an international organization in which the administration of international operations was entrusted to a triumvirate consisting of the Pope, the Sultan, and Martin Luther.

Supporting Executive Functions of the U.N.

If the Russians lost the current round on this issue at the United Nations, they clearly have no intention of abandoning it. Tripartism has become a watchword of Soviet diplomacy in all organizations of the United Nations and elsewhere. They attack single administrators and propose three-headed executives in nearly every intergovernmental conference on almost any subject. They have demanded the addition of neutral

states to the Ten-Nation Disarmament Committee. More serious is the proposal put forward by the Soviet representative at the nuclear test talks in Geneva. This demanded replacing the single administrator envisioned for the nuclear test control organization by an administrative council of three members. The veto-fanged Cerberus called for in this case represents a serious retrogression, for the Soviet Union had earlier accepted the idea of a single administrator whose selection would be subject to approval by the United States, the United Kingdom, and the Soviet Union.

The Soviet defeat on tripartism in the United Nations is a source of some comfort. But while the soundness of our own argument may cheer us in long midnight watches of the General Assembly, our solace will hardly contribute to the major foreign policy objective of an improvement in Communist-free-world relations. To the contrary, if the Soviet argument is really an indefensible attempt to sabotage international organizations, their vigorous espousal of it is a cause for grave concern. Have the Russians just written off all forms of international cooperation? Not quite; but there is no doubt that the development of an operational capacity in international organizations, especially the United Nations, poses a challenge to these doctrines that the Communists have not yet resolved.

On one hand the Soviet Union can decide to reject the substance of international cooperation. But it is unlikely to do so under the cloak of a doctrine as unembroidered and as transparent as that put forward in the General Assembly. As Sir Walter Scott said, you can "Tell that to the marines—the sailors won't believe it." (Yes, it was Sir Walter Scott who first used what we think of as a typical American expression.)

On the other hand, the Soviet Union can move toward the recognition that there are in fact more things between heaven and earth than are dreamt of in the Communist philosophy, that in view of the multiplicity of traditions and ways of life in this world both neutral men and neutral nations are possible—and may even be desirable.

But we also, like the Soviets, have some doctoral homework to do on the executive functions of the United Nations. We have to learn not to be dashed by the invective nor dazzled by the rhetoric of parliamentary diplomacy. We have to learn instead to apply our power even more effectively

in support of the U.N.'s capacity to take executive action. And that means, above all, continuous and hearty U.S. support for "the man who wasn't there."

U.S., Argentine Presidents Exchange Views on Alliance for Progress

PRESIDENT KENNEDY TO MR. FRONDISI

White House press release dated April 27

APRIL 18, 1961

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I am grateful for your letter of April 3 with its eloquent statement of the principles and aims of your government in the field of hemispheric relations. I am especially heartened to be assured of your support in the determination to make the Alliance for Progress¹ an undertaking of transcendent spiritual and material consequence for all the people of the Americas.

Many problems beset the effort to enlarge economic abundance, cultural opportunity and social justice for all the people of the hemisphere. You have masterfully analyzed the demoralizing and disruptive consequences of persisting underdevelopment. I share your belief that we must all work together at the earliest possible time and with the utmost resolution and vigor to overcome this condition.

I have great sympathy for your view that the "initial impetus" should be concentrated on the establishment and expansion of basic industries and services. Industrialization provides the vital means by which the hemisphere can move forward toward a greater and more equitably shared abundance. It is our hope that the *Alianza* will provide a means of raising and generating the capital necessary to stimulate such industrial development.

And I am sure—from your reference to the overcoming of illiteracy and disease and to the need for opportunities corresponding to talent and character—that you agree equally that capital by itself is not enough to do the job.

Experience has shown that capital investment is only one of the conditions of economic growth. Other conditions include an increasingly literate

¹ For texts of an address by President Kennedy and a message to Congress, see *BULLETIN* of Apr. 3, 1961, p. 471.

and healthy population, an expanding supply of administrative and managerial talent, an ever more mobile society and, above all, a growing commitment to social justice so that the returns of growth accrue, not to a single class, but to an entire community. For this reason we believe that social progress has an indispensable role to play in helping create the conditions in which capital investment will lead to meaningful economic growth. Far from being in conflict, economic and social development are essential partners in the task of modernization.

You correctly state that under-development is not limited to grave material need. Economic abundance, agreeable as it may be, is not itself the end of life. A full life, as you wisely note, must be defined in a cultural and spiritual sense. Our concern with economic abundance is precisely to provide the foundation on which our hemisphere may strive for higher cultural and spiritual fulfillment.

The goals of development are simple; the means of development infinitely ramified. I see the process as one of intimate cooperation among the free republics of the hemisphere, in which each will pool his ideas and experience in order to promote the growth of all. I see the Alliance for Progress as a great release of the creative energies of our peoples in a hemisphere defined by freedom, social justice and mutual self-respect.

I warmly welcome your desire for continued consultations between our Governments and for the pooling of our efforts and ideas as we move forward to make the Alliance for Progress a dynamic reality.

Sincerely,

JOHN F. KENNEDY

PRESIDENT FRONDI TO MR. KENNEDY

White House press release dated April 4, as corrected

APRIL 3, 1961

To His Excellency the President of the United States of America

JOHN F. KENNEDY
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I have given most careful attention to the address delivered by Your Excellency on March 13 last before the Latin American Ambassadors in Washington.²

² *Ibid.*

I wish to state to Your Excellency that the announcement of the alliance for progress enunciated therein opens a new historic perspective of the common task of the American Republics.

Our countries constitute a community united by geographical, historical and, above all, spiritual ties that are indissoluble.

We are a branch of the western world. At the time of the great discoveries the western world put out branches to all corners of the earth. To all of them it transmitted the vitality of its culture and its spirit of progress. In this way it came into contact with other ancient cultures and with primitive peoples. It penetrated some of them and used the old and the new values. In others it made its presence actively felt but did not effect a permanent fusion.

America developed as part of the western world. Our indigenous peoples absorbed its religion and its culture. The European peoples who came to our shores became a part of our land forever.

Our political independence, which we gained almost simultaneously, was the first expression of the vitality and maturity of the imported culture, which was thus acquiring an autonomous existence.

From that time on we began the great struggles to develop our national entities, to establish a democratic way of life based on respect for human dignity, and to promote the progress and well-being of our peoples.

The evolution of our Republics was marked by the variety and diversity that are characteristic of human destiny itself, although our ideals and our objectives were the same. We have all faced problems and conflicts in our evolution toward democracy and liberty: internecine struggles, local conflicts, tyranny. In Europe, in full maturity, such conflicts reached the catastrophic dimensions that brought the world to the last war.

On that occasion the United States constituted the moral and material reserve upon which decisive action developed to save permanent values at their final crossroads.

Then, in an unprecedented decision, it put forth a great economic and technical effort in the Marshall plan in order to make possible the rapid reconstruction of a world economically paralyzed by devastation and tottering on the edge of a grave crisis, threatening disintegration which would have been fatal to our civilization.

Today Latin America is also passing through a period of crisis in which basic values are at stake.

Many of our peoples have been successful in re-establishing the democratic institutions essential to the respect for our traditional values, for human liberty, and for an economic regime based on social justice, private enterprise and respect for private property.

Nevertheless, the Latin American nations are troubled by a serious, disturbing factor which hinders our progress, makes it difficult for the governments to satisfy the ever stronger aspirations of the people and, under such conditions, threatens our social stability in the face of the corrosive activities of disruptive demagoguery and propaganda; this negative factor, as Your Excellency has clearly perceived, is that of under-development.

The conditions of under-development prevalent in Latin America disturb and impede all national efforts to bring about an improvement in the living conditions of our peoples.

In very few cases is the national product of the countries of Latin America growing at a rate equal or superior to that of the increase in population; exports, consisting principally of raw materials, have increased less than the population and therefore provide resources considerably under those required for the acquisition of equipment and manufactured articles indispensable for development.

As repositories of a concept of life based on Christianity and western tradition, we uphold the supremacy of spiritual values that constitute the dignity of man. In hours critical for the world and for our countries, we do not hesitate to abandon all attachment to material wealth in defense of that which is vital for mankind.

But in the present crisis of Latin America these values are threatened by the disturbances and frustrations caused our people by their inadequate incomes, which mean economic insecurity and, for many communities, malnutrition, disease, and ignorance.

I have had repeated occasion to point out that the vicious circle of poverty and under-development calls for vigorous solutions. In present world conditions, political as well as economic, no under-developed country can formulate such solutions within the framework of a democratic regime, without the cooperation of the developed countries.

Moreover, I should like to emphasize to Your Excellency that the problem of under-development is a grave question not only in situations of extreme poverty; it is not only a question of overcoming the problem of hunger, contagious diseases or illiteracy; people in the middle of the Twentieth Century aspire to levels of well-being appropriate to this age and not simply to the material necessities of life.

Their aspirations encompass not only the biological needs but also what at this point in civilization and world progress is a full life, in a material and cultural sense and in a physical and spiritual sense. Rural man aspires to become informed and to be heard, democratically, in the making of the national decisions which will affect him; this means educational, transportation and communications facilities, electrification and rural sanitation, equitable commercial treatment; industrial workers who have acquired the skills to operate the complex machinery in the factories aspire to higher cultural levels, to a higher social position, to a state of well-being commensurate with the level of productivity made possible by modern technology.

Professional and technical people and intellectuals also aspire to be respected in their professions and to achieve in the communities to which they belong positions of responsibility commensurate with their capabilities.

This implies not only adequate income levels, but also laboratory and educational facilities, and, above all, recognition by society of their aptitudes and capabilities.

The history of this century indicates that tensions of this type, perhaps even more than those created by extreme poverty, offer fertile soil for the germination of

nihilist movements that can open the door to the irruption of Communist totalitarianism.

In your message to Congress on the subject of the international cooperation programs of the United States,¹ Your Excellency pointed out with great clarity that these programs are not limited to a passive struggle of mere opposition to Communism but have the dynamic aim of demonstrating historically that in the Twentieth Century rapid economic growth can be achieved within the framework of our democratic institutions.

Apart from the Marshall Plan for Europe, in the years following the last World War there has been carried on a vast work of international cooperation in the economic and technical fields in which the United States has had the most important role including that of genuine leadership. However, despite the considerable extent of the effort, from an absolute standpoint, and the positive results obtained, if that effort is measured in relation to the magnitude of the needs of the under-developed countries, it is insufficient in comparison with the urgency of existing problems and tensions.

In an exceptional act of statesmanship immediately after your assumption of the high national and global responsibility of the Presidency of the United States Your Excellency revived the best traditions of a great nation by taking an initiative commensurate with the importance and urgency of the problem.

For that reason I have not been content to limit myself to merely offering my congratulations, however warm they may be.

In this question our destiny as free nations and our responsibility as leaders are at stake. In the name of that responsibility I wish to say today to Your Excellency that my government unreservedly commits itself to the joint cooperative effort of the alliance for progress that you have opened to all the nations of the Americas. This is a decision dictated by the irreversible course I chose for my country when I became head of the government three years ago.

We faced without flinching the difficult task of consolidating our institutions, the free exercise of rights guaranteed by our constitution, and social peace, and at the same time we initiated an economic policy designed to reorganize and stabilize our finances and to promote, on these bases, a process of rapid national development.

Under extremely difficult conditions, our faith in the traditional ideals of the west enabled us, with the support of the people, to demonstrate clearly that the most fitting and most direct road to economic well-being and progress can be constructed within the framework of democracy and freedom, affirming the exercise of man's highest spiritual qualities.

The instruments of government intervention that had previously interfered with the economic life of the nation were removed. We furnished an adequate and definitive solution to the manifold national and international problems with which our country had been burdened for several decades; we called for heavy sacrifice in the nature of austerity on the part of our people to curb the dis-

¹ *Ibid.*, Apr. 10, 1961, p. 507.

integrating process of inflation and to rehabilitate our finances, and we initiated a program of sound development.

Of course, this undertaking would have been impossible of realization if we had not had the valuable cooperation of the nations of Western Europe, to which we are bound by traditional ties, and above all of the United States, your great country, which from the start showed great understanding of the critical importance of the undertaking we were launching.

This cooperation has strengthened the bonds that unite our two countries in a practical and concrete form that is without precedent in our history.

The efforts of my Government have had important and favorable results but have also encountered strong obstacles that have brought about negative results as well. But we persevere in them because we know that they constitute a long-range effort which must be continued by those who follow us.

For this reason, Mr. President, I state to you today that, as President of the Argentines, I consider myself irrevocably a participant in the alliance for progress, aware of the new efforts that it will demand of your country, of mine, and of all the other members of the American Community, but also certain that only through this effort can we fulfill the historic destiny of America in this century charged with anxiety and promise.

The alliance for progress is a joint undertaking implying responsibilities for all as a condition for the achievement of objectives that will benefit all.

As Your Excellency has pointed out, it is a question of undertaking in this decade a decisive effort to place the American peoples on the road to a rapid economic development that will enable them to raise their standards of living and to overcome the social tensions brought about by these living standards.

This program must be properly organized and oriented, in order that the necessarily limited resources may be utilized in the most efficient manner; in spite of the great amount of cooperation envisaged by Your Excellency and the magnitude of the contribution resulting from the efforts of all our countries themselves, it will always be limited in relation to the vastness of the objectives to be achieved.

For this reason I believe it necessary to concentrate the initial impetus on the establishment and strategic expansion of the basic industries and services that will, in turn, permit the acceleration of industrialization and the mechanization of agriculture and thereby rapidly raise the productivity of our economies.

The magnitude of this undertaking also brings up a

question that my Government raised on several occasions over a year ago and that has also been given attention by Your Excellency: it is that of the participation of countries of Western Europe, bound by close traditional ties to Latin America, in this effort at cooperation for its development.

The development of the program presented by Your Excellency will require close contact and exchange of ideas and initiatives among all the participating countries. It will also be necessary to utilize existing institutions to the maximum extent, especially the new Inter-American Development Bank. The studies which have been carried out by the Economic Commission for Latin America and the work done by the OAS [Organization of American States], which culminated in the Conference that authorized the Act of Bogotá,⁴ will also be of great utility.

Nevertheless, I should like to point out to Your Excellency that I believe the magnitude of the task implicit in the alliance for progress will require machinery for cooperation which, while permitting the most effective use of the aforementioned institutions, will have the flexibility and efficiency that will, for example, permit active participation in the program by the countries of Western Europe and will assure efficient channeling of the cooperative effort toward the basic sectors mentioned above. This question, raised by my Government long before the announcement of the program formulated by Your Excellency, now acquires, in our opinion, a much greater timeliness and importance.

My advisers and I myself are prepared to hold consultations with Your Excellency and all the American Governments in order to consider the means necessary for giving the alliance for progress dynamic reality.

Mr. President: Please receive these lengthy comments that I have taken the liberty of expressing as the most direct homage to the lofty spirit that has inspired your transcendent act of statesmanship.

From them you may have gathered the fact that I already consider the alliance for progress as a reality that is on the march, and I am certain that this opinion is held by all the American Governments.

In the course of this march, as we advance toward the conquest of our future, the threat of any attempt from abroad to create disturbances will be removed from this hemisphere, and prosperity attained within the framework of respect for liberty and the rule of justice will be definitively affirmed.

Cordial greetings

ARTURO FRONDISI

⁴ For text, see *ibid.*, Oct. 3, 1960, p. 537.

Economic and Social Progress for Expanding Trade in the Americas

by *Adolf A. Berle*

*Chairman, Task Force on Latin America*¹

This meeting, as I understand it, is to consider the problems of world trade. The Mississippi Valley World Trade Council has a solid impact on that trade. The bases of that trade are changing throughout the world and especially in Latin America. It is of this I wish to speak.

Most of Latin America is well along on an economic and social revolution. The rules of its economic life are changing. They have to change. Whatever happens, you can be sure of that. In Latin America it is simply impossible to continue along the lines marked out more than a century ago. Whether we talk of economics or whether we talk of common humanity, the wealth of Latin America has to be increasingly distributed so that all of its people in all of its countries get a steadily increasing share of the national income, both as it stands now and as it grows. Poverty-stricken men do not buy. Modern mass markets in Latin America as elsewhere are not made up of millionaires.

This ought not to come as any shock to the United States. For more than half a century our own country has been working out ways so that the wealth and income of the United States shall increasingly be distributed. The Granger movement talked of it a century ago. Theodore Roosevelt began it with direct legislation. Woodrow Wilson blocked out more direct additional moves, including income taxes and banking legislation. Henry Ford started the movement in industry for higher wages and continuous employment. The

social security reforms of Franklin Roosevelt carried the process still further.

These policies were conceived primarily as measures for sound human decency. As we see it, everyone willing to work is entitled to a living wage and a share in the prosperity of the country. But, as we know now, these same measures also laid the foundation for the astonishing production, the vast consumption, and the wide distribution in the United States. Briefly, they created markets.

Each time social measures were undertaken there was violent opposition. Critics insisted they would bankrupt business, or the United States, or someone else. Yet, in every case, when the dust cleared away, it was discovered that more people could buy more things than before. Markets were expanded. There was both greater purchasing power and greater desire to consume. So factories could grow, and they did. Those business enterprises which most feared social legislation found that these same measures contributed to their own prosperity. I recall being called a Communist 25 years ago for advocating unemployment insurance and social security. Today even the *Wall Street Journal* and the New York banks consider these measures "built-in stabilizers." In business terms they create a market that keeps on going. They have proved a powerful support and a great factor of growth in the American economic system.

Requisites of Trade

Latin America, save for a few countries—Costa Rica is a brilliant exception—has not yet had this tremendous economic and social change. Cuba,

¹ Address made before the Mississippi Valley World Trade Council at New Orleans, La., on May 4 (press release 289).

for example, did not have distribution of wealth proportionate to her wealth, though she was one of the most prosperous countries in the area. That, I believe, is the reason why Communists there were able to seize the Cuban revolution and twist it into Marxist lines. It is also the reason why Costa Rica is now one of the solidest democracies in Latin America. Translated into commercial language, countries which have had their New Deal have far more customers internally and are far better customers on the world market than those which have not.

This is the theory behind President Kennedy's proposed Alliance for Progress.² It is also the real and burning issue in Latin American politics now. It will continue to be the main issue for some time to come. A 10-year program is contemplated. As plans for the Alliance for Progress develop, I hope you will support them. I hope you will support them chiefly on grounds of human decency and justice. But I hope you also will realize that, over the pull, they will greatly increase the economic exchange between the United States and the rest of the hemisphere. Success, in my judgment, will also determine whether Latin America accomplishes her great development in freedom or whether she tries it under Communist auspices as a concomitant of the cold war.

There is a great analogy between Latin American affairs today and European affairs in 1947. Then, you recall, the Marshall plan was announced. The Soviet Union was intervening with arms to take over Greece. The United States moved at that time to support Greece against that attack. In the following months a cold-war campaign raged all over Europe. The Communists attacked the Marshall plan just as the Communists in Cuba and in South America are attacking President Kennedy and the Alliance for Progress. They mustered all the support they had to try to overthrow every West European government in 1947. They failed. Europe elected progress under freedom and is today one of the most prosperous and powerful areas in the world.

The same result will, I believe, be the result in Latin America in the coming year. The Alliance for Progress will polarize the forces of progress under freedom against the movements worked up

by the Sino-Soviet Communists. The Alliance will find two sets of enemies—enemies of the extreme right, who really want no social change, and the Communists, who basically want to deliver their countries into the hands of the Sino-Soviet bloc under Communist tyranny.

The United States will, I am clear, find itself allied with the great majority of Latin Americans. They want economic progress and social development as much as everyone else, but they want their freedom too. And they have no interest at all in putting themselves, again, under the rule of either European or Asian empires.

Economic Elements Within U.S. Control

Two major economic elements lie within the United States control.

The most important is the fact that the most prized, indeed urgent, necessity for Latin America is access to the markets of the United States. We are the largest buyers of sugar, coffee, bananas, of minerals like copper, oil, bauxite, and, more recently, iron ore. One of the queer ironies in this is the complete upset of the theory of Karl Marx. He considered (Communist propagandists still assert) that countries like the United States got rich because they exploited the less developed areas—like South America—and are bound to conquer them to sell manufactured goods there.

In point of fact the process works just the other way. The less developed countries are the ones that need markets. These they seek in the United States. Cuba as a country was pretty well off, but she got her wealth by selling sugar at an over-price to the American consumer. It is a fair economic statement that Cuba was rich because she could sell sugar to the United States on excellent terms. Her difficulty was not that she was being exploited. She was doing extremely well. It was that she had not achieved a system which distributed her wealth to her masses in proportion to the wealth she was reaping.

The other great element is the proper handling of capital and investment. The United States is still the largest reservoir of capital available for use outside the country. But there are distinct limits to the export of capital. For one thing, the United States does not need to export capital—again a failure of the theory of Karl Marx. Roughly estimating, I should guess the United States will need, internally, an increasing amount of its capital in the next 10 years and

² BULLETIN of Apr. 3, 1961, p. 471.

therefore will wish to export less. I doubt that American private investment is the key to economic problems in Latin America, though in certain respects it can be of great help. For one thing, there is capital available in Latin America, though many Latin Americans have not learnt to use it as effectively as we do. For another, it is a mistake to think that Latin Americans are not good technicians. Many Latin American countries have just as good engineers, chemists, and production men as we do. Many of the best run American enterprises in Latin America are staffed from top to bottom with men of the country in which they work. Their testimony is that Latin Americans managing Latin American enterprises are if anything more effective than North Americans. They are just as honest, they are, or can be, just as well trained, and they know their own countries. Neither the United States nor any other country, including those in Latin America, likes to have its great economic enterprises run by foreigners. The real problem is mobilizing Latin American technique, skill, energy, and capital, along with American capital, to meet Latin American development need.

Like other peoples, Latin Americans do not enjoy foreign ownership of their resources beyond a limited proportion. They have no monopoly on this feeling. After World War I it developed that the great bulk of the radio industry in the United States was owned in Europe. The United States then moved heavily to bring this ownership into American hands. This is why Latin Americans, rightly I think, prefer to finance by borrowing rather than by selling equities, and I think they are right.

I believe that a substantial part of Latin America will eventually come to a mixed system much like that of the United States. Most of their industry will be owned in and by their own countries and controlled by their own nationals, though there will always be a margin where foreign investment is useful. I should imagine that in Latin America—as was true in the United States—presently foreign-owned enterprises will be increasingly selling shares of stock in these enterprises to the citizens, the pension trust funds, the insurance companies, and the other institutions which are emerging in these countries all over the continent.

But in one vital respect the United States can and should help. One difficulty with Latin America has been that, save in a few countries, what we call "social capital" has not been provided. By "social capital" I mean those essential expenditures which are not and will not be commercial. These are moneys spent for schools, for public health, for homesteading and settlement of families on the land, for road systems, and for housing. The Spanish phrase used by President Kennedy in his March 13 speech,³ *techo, trabajo y tierra, salud y escuela*, means "Everyone should have a roof over his head, a job and some land." This implies a social base. Men do not get land without agrarian reform. United States citizens did not: They got land through the Homestead Act. Families do not have houses without credit arrangements to pay for them. Most houses in the United States now are financed through our own Federal Housing Administration. Men do not have and keep jobs unless they have (public) health and schooling. All these call for noncommercial expenditures. They always have.

Now it is no good arguing that Latin America should have tackled this particular job long ago, as did the United States from the time of Jefferson on. Maybe so. But there is no use quarreling with yesterday. This job has to be done. It has to be done quickly, to make up for lost time. It has to be done chiefly by Latin America, with Latin American money and Latin American work. The United States, however, can help. We can assist with substantial contributions toward the creation of a system of universal education. We can assist in building many of the essential road and transport links just as we assisted Europe in rebuilding the essential links blown out in World War II. We can say that an essential element of the Alliance for Progress is the requirement that public and private activity in Latin America shall move into this field and do the job which perhaps should have been done years before. The Alliance for Progress consequently contemplates two kinds of money: money designed for economic development, but also money designed for social development. Both kinds of money can and should be used in connection with matching effort by the countries themselves.

I believe most of Latin America understands this. There is now meeting in Santiago, Chile, a

³ *Ibid.*

conference of what is called ECLA—the Economic Commission for Latin America. That conference will discuss—as Europeans discussed in 1947—arrangements for common markets, lowering of internal tariff barriers, better arrangements for balance-of-payment and exchange problems, unification of the effort. This can offer a powerful element in the building of the Alliance for Progress.

This ECLA meeting will be followed by the special meeting of the Inter-American Economic and Social Council which President Kennedy has suggested.⁴ This inter-American meeting, to take place in early summer, will consider and approve the broad plans and policies to launch the Alliance for Progress in the hemisphere.

Let me add a final word. Social systems will differ in different countries. They will not all look like the United States. Here we favor private ownership over public ownership. But in Chile, for example, the best piece of economic development has been done by its development corporation which is publicly owned and which functions very much like the Tennessee Valley Authority or the Port of New York Authority. There are countries which may well be socialist because that is the economic form their people understand. The Spanish Empire, you must remember, especially in the Indian regions, never had purely private enterprise at all. The famous gold mines one reads of in history were not private; they were operated for the King of Spain. The fact that each country works toward its own social form need not bother us if it is free, friendly, and not a tool of overseas power politics.

The interest of the United States lies, I think, in two fields: first, that each country shall develop itself strongly, successfully, humanely in the manner it chooses and in freedom; second, that no country shall be betrayed, cheated, or intimidated into becoming a pawn of an imperial power struggle of the Sino-Soviet empires, under whom peoples are lost as empires flourish. Granted this, I have no fear of the resulting commercial development so far as the United States is concerned. The stronger, the better educated, the better equipped Latin America is, the more widely its wealth is distributed, the better will be the commerce between our countries.

⁴ *Ibid.*, May 22, 1961, p. 766.

Venezuelan Financial Mission

Press release 302 dated May 9

A special mission of the Government of Venezuela has been engaged in discussions in Washington since May 3 with representatives of the U.S. Government as well as of appropriate inter-American and international organizations concerning the program of the Venezuelan Government for the acceleration of the economic and social development of Venezuela under conditions of political and financial stability. This mission represents a continuation of several contacts which have been maintained since the middle of 1960 between the Government of Venezuela and U.S. financial agencies.

The Venezuelan representatives have informed the Government of the United States of the objectives of the Venezuelan program and of the measures the Government of Venezuela has taken or has under consideration to strengthen the Venezuelan economy, including measures to balance the budget by the increase of tax revenues and the reduction of nonessential expenditures. The Venezuelan program also includes development projects which will contribute to the continued economic growth of Venezuela and the improvement of the social and economic conditions of the Venezuelan people in both rural and urban areas. The mission has outlined its expectations regarding the availability of external resources to supplement domestic resources for the realization of this program.

The U.S. representatives have been impressed with the approach of the Government of Venezuela to this problem of assuring economic and social progress with political stability and with freedom. The United States has confidence in the capacity of the Government of Venezuela to meet the needs of the Venezuelan people under the conditions of representative democracy and a free society.

The Government of Venezuela believes that the United States as well as certain international institutions and some other foreign countries can be of assistance in this program. The U.S. Government wishes to help in any feasible way, such as considering sympathetically appropriate requests for loans and credits for particular projects and requests for other assistance as they are presented by the Government of Venezuela.

Trade and Aid in the Sixties

by Edwin M. Martin

*Assistant Secretary for Economic Affairs*¹

Trade and aid were first linked as a slogan in the closing days of the Marshall plan, when we were bending every effort to get the Europeans to accept for themselves the responsibility of financing their imports through their own exports, even at the cost of restricted consumption at home. We succeeded and got out of the aid business to most of the Marshall plan countries somewhat earlier than we had originally hoped.

But the trade and aid problem of the sixties is a quite different one. Ten years ago we were dealing with countries which had been educated well and already had had fully developed industries with worldwide trading connections. What was required was to restore the physical facilities and the network of trading relationships which war had destroyed.

In the sixties we face the far more difficult problem of creating independent, self-sustaining economies out of countries which have never reached this stage before, which are struggling with a multitude of political, social, as well as economic, problems and many of which, only newly independent, have found themselves in a crosscurrent of international relationships, competitions, and tensions which they were ill prepared to understand, let alone deal with.

By our aid, supplemented by the increasing volume of aid being made available by our newly recovered European friends and by Japan, we hope to enable these people to expand their economic capacity. By our technical assistance we hope to be able to help them to learn the skills that are

required to operate a modern state—political, social, and economic.

We have learned, I think, that emphasis on the economic alone in these countries is not enough. With its sugar income and its large investments of United States capital, Cuba seemed well launched into the "takeoff" period of economic development, yet look what happened. This is but a particularly striking illustration of the vital importance of accompanying economic growth with development of a political and social structure which is able to make and carry out wise decisions with respect to the use of economic resources and to see that the benefits of growing prosperity are so shared that all are eager to make the maximum contribution in the form of self-help and that political stability is assured. This is the essential emphasis in the new program of \$500 million of aid for Latin America which is now in the course of approval by the Congress under the agreement reached at Bogotá last year.² These principles are also vital elsewhere and will be increasingly applied.

Need for Long-Range Planning

A fundamental evolution in people's attitudes along these lines will not come about overnight. To be effective, as well as to insure that economic development is carried out on a basis which makes the most efficient use of available resources, both ours and theirs, it is necessary to plan ahead. This is not socialistic planning or 5-year plans in the Communist sense. It is the kind of investment

¹ Address made before the American Cotton Congress at Lubbock, Tex., on May 9 (press release 297 dated May 8).

² For text of President's message to Congress, see BULLETIN of Apr. 3, 1961, p. 474.

budget planning any large corporation must do to survive. It is merely deciding with respect to major expenditures of resources, and particularly those which fall in the public sector, which ones should come first and which must come next to use properly those which have been made first and to tailor the program as a whole to the probable available resources. The latter is particularly important in order to avoid incomplete projects on the one hand or their completion by a ruinous and bankrupting inflation on the other hand.

Within these broad planning limits there must be provided, of course, adequate opportunities for private saving and private initiative both by the local population and by outsiders. There are many advantages, as we have found, to such private initiative, and we believe these advantages have a significant role to play in the less developed countries. To secure the maximum benefit from them there must be a willingness on the part of the less developed country to provide a climate which is favorable for private investment and, on the other hand, an acceptance by private enterprise of its public responsibilities in a sense which is taken for granted by all responsible business elements in this country but which is only too rare in many of the less developed parts of the world.

Stabilizing Incomes of Less Developed Areas

But aid and technical assistance are, of course, not an end in themselves unless we can say that our end is to end them. To an increasing extent we wish to build an economic capacity in the developing countries not only to raise their standard of living but to pay for the imports required to keep their economy going. In addition, of course, we would like to be repaid some of the investment of capital which we are making in these countries. I believe that without exception the countries themselves are also anxious to stand on their own feet and pay their own way. The major issue is how they can do so. We must pay increasing attention to planning their economic development along lines which will provide them a permanent and growing income from exports.

In most of these areas we start with a capacity for the export of primary commodities like oil, minerals, and tropical foodstuffs. Many countries are almost entirely dependent on the export of one or two or three such commodities, and their annual income fluctuates widely as their prices

are affected by business conditions in the industrialized parts of the world. Moreover, most of them are now available in quantities much larger than consumers are prepared to buy and pay for, though not always larger than they could easily use. We must, I believe, first address ourselves to the problem of increasing and stabilizing their income from the sales of these products.

More vigorous growth of our own economy will, of course, provide larger markets. There are presently in the United States and Europe restrictions, special taxes, and other devices which limit the markets for such products, in many cases without justification.

In addition to steps along these lines there is a growing feeling that specific steps can be taken to stabilize the prices of some of these products and thereby the level of income received. Active discussions are under way with respect to coffee and cocoa. Some work is being done on lead and zinc. There are, of course, agreements with respect to tin, sugar, and wheat. There is a rubber and a wool and a cotton study group. Effective international arrangements in any of these areas will be complicated and difficult to work out. Consumers cannot participate in programs to guarantee prices unless producers are willing to limit output and bear a major share of the load of carrying unsalable surpluses. Consideration must be given to the effect of price-stabilization measures on developments of substitutes, synthetic or otherwise. It would not make economic sense to freeze production patterns geographically or otherwise and thus bar normal economic progress. But I say again, there is a belief that progress can be made on this subject, and we are working actively to this end.

Apart from specific commodity agreements there has been considerable thought given in recent months to the possibility of other arrangements for stabilizing the foreign exchange income of countries heavily dependent on exports of a few key commodities. Some have suggested commercial-type insurance schemes, but I am not optimistic that this will prove financially feasible. Others have suggested that the present arrangements under which the International Monetary Fund can make short-term balance-of-payment credits available to countries in temporary difficulties should be liberalized and extended. I am not sure what will be found practicable and acceptable, but it is desirable that by one or other

of the various devices described above, we make progress in increasing and stabilizing the income of less developed countries from exports of this character.

But I am afraid this is not enough. I mentioned above oil, minerals, and foodstuffs. There is now an appreciable surplus of nearly all of them at the present time. In fact one of the key problems we face in the field of agriculture in the less developed areas is finding things that can be grown which do not add to world surpluses. Some production must be cut back as uneconomic or excessive. Some new lands must be opened up for settlement to take care of surplus population. It is difficult to find cash crops to grow which will find a profitable market.

Challenge to U.S. Economy

We must, I fear, face the fact that many of the less developed countries, if they are ever to be economically independent, will have to export manufactured products. It is, of course, a natural consequence of economic development that they should not only expand their mineral and agricultural production but begin to manufacture the simpler products they need themselves or products for which they have particular aptitudes or raw materials. As their skills increase and as capital becomes available, the natural course of development will be for them to expand their output of such items and try to find a place for their products in world markets. In view of their capital shortage it is also only natural that in many cases their first efforts will be in labor-intensive industries.

Thus it seems to me that we must face over the coming years a gradual growth in exports of manufactured products which, by combining modern technology with abundant and cheap labor, will be highly competitive in European and American markets. What has been happening over the past few years with respect to some exports of Japan will slowly be repeated on a much smaller scale in a number of other countries if their economic development in fact takes place.

What shall we do about it? I do not know what all the answers will be. The problems created will be new and difficult. The United States in particular has never faced on any extensive scale, until the postwar growth of Japanese industry, this

kind of competition from up-to-date technology and plentiful labor.

I can only say that if we are to meet the major challenge of the sixties—the bringing along of the less developed areas into economic as well as political independence with a form of society which makes them congenial neighbors in a world all too small—we shall have to find a solution to this problem.

An indication of one approach to it is perhaps given by the program announced by the President last week with respect to textiles.³ This program is based on three principles:

The first is the effort to make our own industry as competitive as possible. We must take advantage of every asset we have in the field of science, of technology, and cheap capital to make our output more efficient than that of anyone else. We must not penalize our industry by forcing it to pay higher raw-material costs than foreign industry in order to accomplish a national purpose which is based on national benefits. We must see that tax laws do not inhibit a rapid adjustment to technology.

A second principle is to provide assistance in converting productive resources of capital and labor to new types of output when the competition from outside becomes too strong for them. The President's program makes specific reference to trade-adjustment legislation which he hopes to introduce. This will help some, but I would like to emphasize another factor, which is not specifically applicable to textiles alone and therefore was not included in the program, which is in my judgment an essential ingredient of any successful attack on the whole problem of foreign competition. This is the vital importance of securing and maintaining a more rapid growth of the United States economy as a whole. During the past 100 years many United States industries have died without serious social maladjustment because we are a growing country with a growing economy. The idle capital and labor could quickly find new tasks. When the economy stagnates and this is not possible, then the social consequences of the kind of competition and the kind of economic change which have made the United States the prosperous nation it is become too great. The tendency in such circumstances is to turn to

³ See p. 825.

artificial controls over the competitive process, designed to preserve the past rather than moving into a future of greater opportunities.

The third and final principle of the President's program is to undertake international negotiations to seek an orderly evolution of the exports of less developed areas along with an orderly opening up of restrictions against such exports by the consuming countries. At present the United States and Canada are taking an unduly large share of exports of textiles from countries which in recent years have been able to combine advance technology and abundant cheap labor. As we have seen, the less developed countries must find markets for exports of manufactured products. It is just as reasonable and essential that the burden of providing these markets be shared by the more advanced countries that share in the giving of aid. At the same time it is to the interests of the less developed countries to make this burden tolerable by developing their capacity and exports of such products in an orderly fashion.

No one can deny that such a negotiation will be exceedingly difficult and complex. But success in achieving it is at the heart of the program of creating a satisfactory environment in the world around us in which we Americans can live the kind of life we wish to live. Only in an atmosphere of increasingly liberal economic opportunities can we insure for the future the growth in our economic strength, the expansion of world trade, and the development of sound and reliable independent countries in the free world which is so essential to the preservation of our way of life against the enemies which are currently attacking it with such vigor and persistence. With this at stake I am sure we can and will succeed for we cannot help but have the full support of people of good will everywhere, including informed Americans like yourselves.

Mr. Ball Visits Europe for Talks With Officials on Textile Matters

Press release 314 dated May 12

Under Secretary for Economic Affairs George W. Ball will leave May 16 for Europe for the purpose of holding exploratory conversations with government officials of several of the major textile consuming countries. These conversations

will be held in accordance with the President's announcement of May 2, 1961, that the Department of State would initiate contacts leading to future talks with the principal textile exporting and importing countries.

Mr. Ball is going first to London, where he is expected to stay for about a week. He will then travel to Bonn, Paris, Rome, Brussels, and possibly Geneva; talks will be held at a later date with other interested governments. A more detailed itinerary will be announced later.

President Announces Program To Aid U.S. Textile Industry

White House press release dated May 2

The President announced on May 2 a program of assistance to the U.S. textile industry, designed to meet a wide range of the problems it faces as a result of rapid technological change, shifts in consumer preference, and increasing international competition. The program was developed by the Cabinet committee, headed by Secretary of Commerce Luther H. Hodges, which was formed by the President on February 16, 1961. In announcing the program the President said:

The problems of the textile industry are serious and deep-rooted. They have been the subject of investigation at least as far back as 1935, when a Cabinet committee was appointed by President Roosevelt to investigate the conditions in this industry. Most recently these problems were the subject of a special study by the interdepartmental committee headed by Secretary of Commerce Luther H. Hodges. I believe it is time for action.

It is our second largest employer. Some 2 million workers are directly affected by conditions in the industry. There are another 2 million persons employed in furnishing requirements of the industry at its present level of production. Two years ago the Office of Defense Mobilization testified that it was one of the industries essential to our national security. It is of vital importance in peacetime, and it has a direct effect upon our total economy. All the studies have shown that unemployment in textile mills strikes hardest at those communities suffering most from depressed conditions.

I propose to initiate the following measures:

First, I have directed the Department of Commerce to launch an expanded program of research, covering new products, processes, and markets. This should be done in cooperation with both union and management groups.

Second, I have asked the Treasury Department to review existing depreciation allowances on textile machinery. Revision of these allowances, together with adoption of the investment-incentive credit proposals contained in my message to the Congress of April 20, 1961,¹ should assist in the modernization of the industry.

Third, I have directed the Small Business Administration to assist the cotton textile industry to obtain the necessary financing for modernization of its equipment.

Fourth, I have directed the Department of Agriculture to explore and make recommendations to eliminate or offset the cost to United States mills of the adverse differential in raw cotton costs between domestic and foreign textile producers.

Fifth, I will shortly send to the Congress a proposal to permit industries seriously injured or threatened with serious injury as a result of increased imports to be eligible for assistance from the Federal Government.

Sixth, I have directed the Department of State to arrange for calling an early conference of the principal textile exporting and importing countries. This conference will seek an international understanding which will provide a basis for trade that will avoid undue disruption of established industries.

Seventh, in addition to this program, an application by the textile industry for action under existing statutes, such as the escape clause or the national security provision of the Trade Agreements Extension Act, will be carefully considered on its merits.

I believe this program will assist our textile industry to meet its basic problems, while at the same time recognizing the national interest in expansion of world trade and the successful development of less developed nations. It takes into account the dispersion of the industry, the range of its products, and its highly competitive character. It is my hope that these measures will strengthen the industry and expand consumption of its products without disrupting international trade and without disruption of the markets of any country.

¹ H. Doc. 140, 87th Cong., 1st sess.

Certain Tariff Concessions Renegotiated by Japan

Press release 206 dated April 12

DEPARTMENT ANNOUNCEMENT

Documents incorporating the results of trade negotiations between Japan and the United States were signed at Geneva, Switzerland, on April 10, 1961. These agreements represent the culmination of tariff negotiations between the two countries under article XXVIII of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT) which began in Geneva last September.¹ The documents were signed by Morio Aoki, leader of the Japanese delegation, and Carl D. Corse, chairman of the U.S. delegation.

Japan is one of the contracting parties which have taken the opportunity to modify or withdraw certain tariff concessions which were bound in their schedules to the General Agreement.

Of the concessions on 21 statistical class numbers renegotiated by Japan, 19 were initially negotiated with the United States. Japanese imports of these 21 items from the United States were valued at \$115,199,000 in 1959, of which \$90,203,000 consisted of soybeans and \$22,976,000 of polyethylene. The U.S. trade interest was negligible in the two concessions which were not negotiated with the United States.

Under the settlement Japan will completely withdraw its concession on only one item—passenger cars with a wheel base over 254 centimeters but not over 270 centimeters. Since the United States does not produce a passenger car with such a wheel base, this withdrawal of the concession should improve the competitive position of the larger American cars vis-a-vis the smaller imported cars. Japan is rebinding its tariff (modifying the rates but retaining them in its GATT schedule) on the remaining items at a higher rate to the United States. Soybeans will be rebound at 13 percent ad valorem as compared with the present rate of 10 percent. It is believed that this small increase will not affect substantially U.S. exports of this product to Japan. The new rate of 13 percent ad valorem will not go into effect until imports of this commodity are liberalized by placing the item under the automatic licensing

¹ For background, see BULLETIN of Sept. 19, 1960, p. 453.

system. The present ad valorem duty of 20 percent on polyethylene is being converted to a specific rate of duty of 52 yen per kilogram. The ad valorem equivalent of this new rate is a little less than 19 percent. It appears, however, that lower costs of production may result in a somewhat higher ad valorem equivalent during future years. Japan is also increasing the duty on certain machine tools.

In addition to the rebinding of 17 items in its article XXVIII list, the Japanese Government has offered to the United States new compensatory concessions on 20 items. Imports of these from the United States in 1959 were valued at

about \$66 million. Nine of the items were not in Japan's existing schedule of concessions and will be bound against increase for the first time. In accordance with established procedures full consideration was given to the requests by the United States producers and exporters for concessions in the Japanese market. Among the products on which concessions were obtained, American producers have evinced particular interest in raisins, bourbon whisky, certain machine tools and machinery, musical instruments, fountain pens and parts, and certain types of camera film. Imports in 1959 of agricultural products on which concessions were granted amounted to \$59 million.

CONCESSIONS TO BE MODIFIED

CONCESSIONS TO THE UNITED STATES TO BE MODIFIED SCHEDULE XXXVIII—JAPAN

Tariff item number	Abbreviated commodity description	Rate of duty		
		Japanese statutory rate	Bound rate in existing Japanese schedule	Proposed rate to be bound
ex 211	Soya beans.....	10%	10%	13%
ex 321	Mayonnaise, French dressings and salad dressings.....	25%	18%	25%
ex 327	Powdered milk.....	30%	30%	40%
ex 341	Skimmed milk, dried (excluding that to be used for school lunches).....	25%	25%	45%
ex 515	Lard.....	10%	5%	15 yen per kg. (21% a.v.e.)
ex 666	Pig fat having an acid value of 2 or less.....	10%	5%	15 yen per kg. (19% a.v.e.)
ex 670	Polyethylene, used as materials for further manufacture.....	20%	20%	52 yen per kg. (19% a.v.e.)
ex 1634	Toluene, pure.....	5%	5%	10%
	Gramophone records:			
	With revolutions per minute not exceeding 40.....	30%	20%	170 yen each (20% a.v.e.)
	With revolutions per minute exceeding 40 but not exceeding 50.....	30%	20%	70 yen each (30% a.v.e.)
	With revolutions per minute exceeding 50.....	30%	20%	56 yen each (30% a.v.e.)
ex 1642	Passenger cars (including passenger jeeps), over 254 centimeters but not over 270 centimeters in wheel base.	40%	35%	withdrawn
ex 1679	Metalworking machinery:			
	Lathes for metal working:			
	Engine lathes, with a swing over bed of 1,000 millimeters and over.	15%	15%	25%
	Automatic copying lathes, with a swing over bed of less than 600 millimeters.	15%	15%	25%
	Automatic lathes, single spindle, of bar type.....	15%	15%	25%
	Vertical lathes, with a table of 2,000 millimeters and over in diameter.	15%	15%	25%
ex 1679	Boring machines for metal working:			
	Horizontal boring machines, with a main boring spindle of less than 200 millimeters in diameter.	15%	15%	25%
ex 1679	Milling machines for metal working:			
	Universal tool milling machines.....	15%	15%	25%
	Profile milling machines (including diesinking machines equipped with one or two milling spindles and a working surface of less than 1 square meter, excluding hand operation type machines and cam type machines).	15%	15%	25%
	Plano-millers, with a table of not more than 2,000 millimeters in width.	15%	15%	25%

CONCESSIONS TO THE UNITED STATES TO BE MODIFIED
SCHEDULE XXXVIII—JAPAN—Continued

Tariff item number	Abbreviated commodity description	Rate of duty		
		Japanese statutory rate	Bound rate in existing Japanese schedule	Proposed rate to be bound
ex 1679	Grinding machines for metal working: Internal grinding machines, with a maximum working diameter of less than 200 millimeters, excluding centerless type.	15%	15%	25%
	Surface grinding machines, rectangular table type, with a maximum grinding length of less than 2,000 millimeters, and vertical surface grinding machines, rotary table type.	15%	15%	25%
ex 1679	Gear cutting machines for metal working: Vertical hobbing machines, single spindle, with a table of 700 millimeters and over in diameter.	15%	15%	25%
ex 1736	X-ray film (not fluorography), unexposed, for medical uses.	10%	10%	20%
ex 1736	X-ray film (not fluorography), unexposed, except for medical uses.	10%	10%	20%
ex 1736	X-ray film (fluorography), unexposed.	10%	10%	20%

COMPENSATORY CONCESSIONS

COMPENSATORY CONCESSIONS TO THE UNITED STATES
SCHEDULE XXXVIII—JAPAN

Tariff item number	Abbreviated commodity description	Rate of duty		
		Japanese statutory rate	Bound rate in existing Japanese schedule	Proposed rate to be bound
ex 208	Grain sorghum (kao-liang), unmilled, for feeding purposes.	5%		free
ex 209	Indian corn, unmilled, for feeding purposes.	10%	10%	free
ex 212	Wheat flour for the manufacture of monosodium glutamate.	25%		12.5%
ex 221	Safflower seed.	free		5% ¹
ex 301	Raisins (dried grapes).	20%	10%	5%
ex 339	Bourbon whisky.	50%	40%	35%
ex 515	Beef tallow.	5%	5%	4%
620	Rosin.	5%	5%	free
ex 670	Xylene, chemically refined.	5%		5%
ex 670	Xylene, not chemically refined.	5%		5%
ex 1522	Gear cutters.	20%	18%	15%
ex 1635	Musical instruments, excluding pianos, organs, accordions, and harmonicas, whether electromagnetic, electrostatic, electronic or not.	20%		15%
ex 1642	Wheel tractors, other than steam engine type, excluding autotricycles.	30%	30%	20%
ex 1678	Pneumatic machines.	15%		15%
ex 1679	Automatic lathes, multispindle, excluding those of bar type with not more than 6 spindles.	15%	15%	10%
ex 1679	Profile milling machines (including diesinking machines) equipped with not less than three milling spindles, or working surface of not less than 1.5 square meter; excluding cam type machines.	15%	15%	10%
ex 1740	Fountain pens, including ball pens, mechanical pencils, pencils, and pens (with holders or caps made of, or combined with, precious metals, etc.) and parts.	50%	40%	30%
ex 1740	Other fountain pens.	25%	25%	20%
1745	Wheat bran.	free		free
ex 1749	Rolls of sensitized photographic paper for diffusion transfer process, combined with transferring materials and developing agents.	20%		15%

¹ This "ceiling binding" is designed to preclude the 10 percent rate contemplated by the Japanese Government.

Food-for-Peace Council Members Named by President Kennedy

The White House announced on May 6 the appointment by President Kennedy of the members of the American Food-for-Peace Council. The American Food-for-Peace Council is a group of men and women who will provide citizen leadership for both the United States Food-for-Peace Program and the Freedom-From-Hunger Campaign of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations. The Council will serve a threefold purpose in (1) counseling with the Nation's Food-for-Peace Director, George McGovern; (2) developing public information on world hunger; and (3) enlisting support for the attack on world hunger.

The following have accepted membership on the Council:

Cochairmen: James A. Michener and Mrs. Raymond Clapper.

Members: Marian Anderson, Dwayne O. Andreas, Yul Brynner, Clark M. Clifford, Dorothy Ferebee, Raymond C. Firestone, Luther H. Foster, John A. Hannah, Clifford R. Hope, Danny Kaye, Mrs. Albert D. Lasker, Murray D. Lincoln, Mrs. Florence Stephenson Mahoney, Robert Nathan, Drew Pearson, James A. Pike, Arthur C. Ringland, Carroll P. Streeter, Charles P. Taft, Jesse Tapp, and Harold A. Vogel.

The following organizations have been invited to designate representatives for membership on the American Food-for-Peace Council:

Advertising Council
American Agricultural Editors Association
American Association of Agricultural College Editors
American Association of Land-Grant Colleges and State Universities
American Association for the United Nations
American Association of University Women
American Council on Education
American Council of Voluntary Agencies for Foreign Service
American Farm Bureau Federation
American Federation of Labor-Congress of Industrial Organizations
American Feed Manufacturers Association
American Friends Service Committee
American Institute of Nutrition
American Jewish Joint Distribution Committee
American Merchant Marine Institute
American National Red Cross

American Newspaper Guild
American Newspaper Publishers Association
American Petroleum Institute
American School Food Service Association
American Seed Trade Association
American Wheat Institute
Association of Junior Leagues of America
Boy Scouts of America
Brookings Institution
CARE, Inc.
Catholic Relief Services, National Catholic Welfare Conference
Chamber of Commerce of the United States
Child Welfare League of America
Church World Service
Cooperative League of the U.S.A.
Committee for International Economic Growth
Community Development Foundation
Dairy Society International
Farm Equipment Institute
4-H Clubs
Future Farmers of America
Future Homemakers of America
General Federation of Women's Clubs
Girl Scouts of America
Grocery Manufacturers of America
League of Women Voters of the United States
Lutheran World Relief
Mennonite Central Committee
Motion Picture Association of America
National Academy of Sciences-National Research Council
National Association of Broadcasters
National Association of Television and Radio Farm Directors
National Canners Association
National Council of Farmer Cooperatives
National Education Association
National Farmers Union
National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs
National Grange
National Plant Food Institute
National Social Welfare Assembly
Newspaper Farm Editors Association
Public Affairs Institute
Unitarian Service Committee
U.S. Junior Chamber of Commerce
Vegetable Growers Association of America
Seventh-Day Adventist Welfare Service
Carnegie Endowment for International Peace
Ford Foundation
Kellogg (W. K.) Foundation
Rockefeller Foundation
Twentieth Century Fund
Civitan International
Kiwanis International
Lions International
Optimist International
Rotary International

Department Supports Revision of ITU Convention and Radio Regulations

*Statement by Edwin M. Martin
Assistant Secretary for Economic Affairs*¹

The International Telecommunication Union (ITU) is an international organization composed of 98 member countries and 5 associate members. It has two basic purposes. The first is the voluntary coordination of international telecommunications by the members in such a manner as to assure their most efficient, economical, and rapid transmission. For example, one of the oldest and most important regulations adopted by the Union is that concerned with the transmission of messages pertaining to safety of life at sea.

The second purpose is the maintenance and extension of international cooperation for the improvement of telecommunications and the advancement of telecommunication knowledge. This includes the exchange of information concerning technical advances and projects for the development of new technical facilities which will increase the usefulness of the services and make them more generally available to the public. The affairs of the Union are governed by an international telecommunication convention, which is revised when necessary by a plenipotentiary conference.

The conventions of the Union serve a dual purpose: They comprise the charter of the Union, establishing its membership and structure, and also contain the treaty provisions laying down the basic principles under which telecommunications are coordinated internationally. These basic principles are supplemented by radio, telegraph, and telephone regulations which spell out the methods by which the principles are put into effect. These regulations are the product of ordinary and extraordinary administrative conferences.

The latest convention is the one presently before the Senate for consideration.² It is a revision of the convention drawn up at Buenos Aires in 1952 and was signed at the plenipotentiary conference in Geneva in December 1959 by the United States and 84 other countries.

¹ Made before the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations on May 2 (press release 281).

² For text of (1) the International Telecommunication Convention, with annexes, and (2) the final protocol to the convention, see S. Ex. J, 86th Cong., 2d sess.

The Buenos Aires convention contained the traditional provision that a plenipotentiary conference shall normally meet once every 5 years at a date and place fixed by the preceding plenipotentiary conference. It also provided that an ordinary radio conference normally shall meet once every 5 years, preferably at the same time and place as the plenipotentiary conference. In the past these conditions have not always been met, and the Geneva plenipotentiary conference was not convened until October 4, 1959. The radio conference was convened at Geneva on August 17, 1959, and both conferences completed their work on December 21, 1959.

Geneva Plenipotentiary Conference

Briefly, the outstanding decisions and accomplishments of the plenipotentiary conference were as follows:

The conference rejected proposals by the Soviet bloc to modify the membership provisions and confirmed the existing provisions. The revised list of members of the Union (subject to ratification of or adherence to the convention) includes (1) those listed as members in the Buenos Aires convention including the four countries, Ecuador, Honduras, Liberia, and Yemen, which, up to the time of the conference, had not ratified or acceded to that convention; (2) those admitted since 1952 by the procedure of two-thirds consent or by their membership in the United Nations and their accession to the ITU convention; and (3) the five associate members.

The Administrative Council was increased in size from 18 members of the Union to 25, and Africa was added as a separate region. Both the Atlantic City convention—1947—and Buenos Aires—1952—had fixed the Council at 18 countries divided into 4 regions as follows:

American region—5 members;
Europe and Africa—5 members;
Eastern Europe and northern Asia—3 members;
Asia and Australasia—5 members.
Total—18 members.

The regional distribution of the additional seats was figured on a mathematical basis, with the number of countries in each region governing the number of seats. The United States delegation recognized the validity of the argument that the African region should be represented as an entity on the Council.

Each region except Eastern Europe gained 1 member, while Africa was given 4 seats. Under the revised convention the Administrative Council is constituted as follows:

American region-6 members;

Europe-6 members;

Africa-4 members;

Eastern Europe and northern Asia-3 members;

Asia and Australasia-6 members.

Total-25 members.

According to the provisions of the Atlantic City and Buenos Aires conventions the Secretary General and two Assistant Secretaries General were elected by the Administrative Council. Proposals were submitted at Geneva to change this procedure and to provide that the Secretary General and the Assistant Secretaries General should be elected by the plenipotentiary conference. The conference adopted this principle by a very large majority, and a United States national, Gerald C. Gross, was elected Secretary General. At the same time the conference accepted the United States proposal for the elimination of one of the posts of Assistant Secretary General and for the replacement of the other Assistant Secretary General by a Deputy Secretary General. An Indian national was elected Deputy Secretary General.

The International Frequency Registration Board (IFRB) was proposed by the United States and adopted by the International Telecommunication Conference, Atlantic City 1947, to serve as an independent body of 11 coequal members in the field of radio spectrum management. It has served the ITU faithfully since that time; however, the United States made proposals at the Geneva conference to effect certain improvements. Outstanding among such proposals adopted by the conference were: the provision for the direct election of specific candidates nominated by the respective countries of which they are nationals; the establishment of a limitation upon the recall by members of their nationals on the Board.

The conference ratified the action of the Administrative Council in amalgamating the International Telephone Consultative Committee (CCIF) and the International Telegraph Consultative Committee (CCIT) into one organ, the International Telegraph and Telephone Consultative Committee (CCITT).

The United States was successful in bringing about the assimilation of the secretariat to the

United Nations "common system" of employees' salaries, allowances, and pensions, the adoption of a consolidated budget, the further improvement of the structure of the secretariat, and the elimination from the convention and the general regulations of the provision permitting attendance of observers from noncontracting governments. It is believed that the collaboration between the United States and other countries maintained the best traditions of the ITU in its long record of international cooperation.

The Radio Regulations

As regards the radio conference, the United States had submitted a very comprehensive proposal in the form of a complete new text for the radio regulations. This was broken down by the ITU secretariat into several hundred proposals. Some of these were of major importance, while others were not of great consequence. A majority of the United States proposals were adopted by the conference in substance if not in form. Briefly the major decisions and accomplishments of the radio conference were as follows:

There was a partial reorientation of the duties of the International Frequency Registration Board and a slight increase in the scope of its authority. This was accompanied by changes designed to increase its independence as an international body of experts.

Technical regulations were revised to reflect more accurately the current state of the radio art. In general the new technical requirements are not more strict than current good engineering practices in the United States.

At the same time, operating regulations which deal with the maritime mobile and aeronautical mobile radio services were considerably revised.

In the complex field of international frequency management procedures, results quite compatible with United States interests were achieved.

Existing procedures were modified substantially. The new procedures are intended to produce on an evolutionary basis an international record of current frequency usage. Special procedures, based upon a United States proposal, were adopted for high-frequency broadcasting.

In the field of frequency allocations a large number of actions were taken, and for the first time progress was made in gaining recognition of

spectrum requirements for radio astronomy and for space research programs.

Conclusion

It is obvious that the International Telecommunication Convention and the annexed radio regulations which will be considered by this committee include complex provisions. Mr. Arthur L. Lebel, Acting Chief of the Telecommunications Division of the Department of State; Commissioner T. A. M. Craven of the Federal Communications Commission; the chairman of the United States delegation to the radio conference, Commissioner Rosel H. Hyde, also of the Federal Communications Commission, are present and prepared to answer any questions you may have on the technical details of the treaties. Commissioner Craven is prepared to make a statement before the committee on behalf of the Commission.

In closing I should like to point out that the convention entered into force on January 1, 1961, as between the members who have ratified it. Article 17 of the convention provides that a signatory government which has not deposited an instrument of ratification within a period of 2 years from the date of the convention's entry into force shall not be entitled to vote at conferences or meetings of the Union. Because of the importance of international telecommunications to this country, the United States plays a leading role in all the activities of the Union. Hence early ratification of the convention and the annexed radio regulations will materially assist this Government in protecting its interests and the interests of its citizens and in maintaining its leadership at related international conferences. I should, therefore, like to urge the earliest possible consent by the Senate to the ratification of these two treaties.

GATT Contracting Parties Convene at Geneva for 18th Session

Press release 312 dated May 12

The Contracting Parties to the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT) will hold their 18th session at Geneva from May 15 through 19. There are 38 nations which have acceded to the GATT, and a number of other countries either have acceded provisionally or have other special relationships with the Contracting Parties.

Theodore J. Hadraba, Director, Office of International Trade, Department of State, will be chairman of the U.S. delegation. Harold T. Macgowan, Bureau of Foreign Commerce, Department of Commerce, will be vice chairman, and Carl D. Corse, U.S. representative to the GATT Council of Representatives, will be the special adviser to the delegation. Advisers from the Departments of State, Treasury, Agriculture, Commerce, and Labor will make up the remainder of the delegation.

The GATT, as the basic instrument guiding commercial relations among most of the principal trading nations of the world, is the cornerstone of U.S. commercial policy. The provisions of the GATT are designed to promote mutually beneficial international trade and thereby to raise living standards, expand productive employment, and utilize more fully the resources of the world. The various meetings of the Contracting Parties to the GATT, such as the 18th session, provide an international forum in which the Contracting Parties work to achieve the aims of the GATT, discuss trade policy problems, and attempt to resolve trade difficulties in a manner conducive to the growth rather than the reduction of trade levels.

The present 1-week session runs concurrently with the GATT tariff negotiations conference which began at Geneva, September 1, 1960.¹

Of the approximately 30 agenda items scheduled for consideration by the Contracting Parties, some of the more significant ones deal with the association of Finland with the European Free Trade Association; a review of latest developments on the special three-pronged program for the expansion of trade through (1) tariff negotiations, (2) an examination of agricultural protectionism, and (3) the maintenance and expansion of the export earnings of the less developed countries; and the removal of quantitative import restrictions.

The Contracting Parties will hear reports at this session on consultations the United States and other contracting parties have just held with Italy and France on their remaining quantitative restrictions. Also, the GATT Committee on Balance-of-Payments Restrictions, of which the United States is a member, will report on the con-

¹ For background, see BULLETIN of Sept. 19, 1960, p. 453.

sultations held in April with several countries still imposing import restrictions for balance-of-payments reasons. The removal of quantitative restrictions by other countries has been a principal objective of the United States, and the work of this committee and other GATT mechanisms have been important factors in influencing the relaxation of such restrictions upon trade.

Argentine Government Ratifies Investment Guaranty Agreement

The Department of State announced on May 8 (press release 296) that the Argentine Government has ratified an investment guaranty agreement for convertibility encouragement for the investment of private American capital in Argentine business enterprises.

The agreement extends the provisions of the U.S. investment guaranty program to American private investments in Argentine business ventures. The program is administered by the U.S. International Cooperation Administration as part of the Mutual Security Program.

Under the agreement the U.S. Government will provide a guaranty that American private capital invested in Argentine enterprises and local currency receipts from such investments will remain convertible into dollars. The U.S. Government guaranty will be available for new U.S. private investments of capital goods, services, patents, and loans which are approved for purposes of the ICA guaranty by the Government of Argentina. For this insurance the U.S. investor will pay a premium of one-half of 1 percent per year for the amount of investment guaranteed.

The agreement with Argentina makes it the 11th Latin American nation to participate in the investment guaranty program. Other Latin American nations participating are: Bolivia, Chile, Costa Rica, Ecuador, El Salvador, Haiti, Honduras, Nicaragua, Paraguay, and Peru. Ratification of agreements signed by Colombia, Guatemala, and Panama are pending.

Altogether 51 countries have signed agreements to institute the investment guaranty program. As of March 31, 1961, a total of \$571.4 million in ICA guaranties had been issued for investments in countries already participating in the program, and applications in process exceed \$1.5 billion.

United States and Senegal Sign Technical Cooperation Agreement

Press release 316 dated May 13

Karim Gaye, Minister of Planning, Development and Technical Cooperation of the Republic of Senegal, and Henry R. Labouisse, Director of the International Cooperation Administration, on May 13 signed a basic technical cooperation agreement which will enable the United States to cooperate with Senegal in carrying out its economic development plan.

Mr. Gaye has been in Washington to conclude negotiations on the agreement with senior officials of the International Cooperation Administration. Preliminary negotiations were carried on in Dakar by the representative of the ICA who was assigned to Dakar shortly before Senegalese independence.

The initial U.S. contribution will consist of financing commodity imports, primarily rice. Proceeds of the sale of these commodities by Senegal will be used, in turn, to finance various projects within the Senegalese development plan, such as construction of vocational and primary schools, and other projects still to be agreed upon by the two countries.

Current Treaty Actions

MULTILATERAL

Fisheries

Declaration of understanding regarding the International Convention for the Northwest Atlantic Fisheries of February 8, 1949 (TIAS 2089). Done at Washington April 24, 1961.¹

Signatures: France,² May 5, 1961; Federal Republic of Germany,² Iceland,² Norway,² Portugal,² and Union of Soviet Socialist Republics,² May 8, 1961.

Law of the Sea

Convention on the territorial sea and the contiguous zone;¹

Convention on the high seas;¹

Convention on fishing and conservation of the living resources of the high seas;¹

Convention on the continental shelf.¹

Done at Geneva April 29, 1958.

Accession deposited: Senegal, April 25, 1961.

Postal Services

Universal postal convention with final protocol, annex, regulations of execution, and provisions regarding airmail, with final protocol. Done at Ottawa October 3,

¹ Not in force.

² Without reservation as to acceptance.

1957. Entered into force April 1, 1959. TIAS 4202.
Adherence deposited: Mall, April 21, 1961.

Telecommunications

Radio regulations, with appendixes, annexed to the international telecommunication convention, 1959. Done at Geneva December 21, 1959. Entered into force May 1, 1961.^a

BILATERAL

Canada

Agreement governing the coordination of pilotage services on the Great Lakes and the St. Lawrence River. Effected by exchange of notes at Washington May 5, 1961. Entered into force May 5, 1961.

China

Agreement supplementing the agricultural commodities agreement of August 30, 1960, as supplemented and amended (TIAS 4563, 4628, 4634, and 4686). Effected by exchange of notes at Taipei April 27, 1961. Entered into force April 27, 1961.

Colombia

Agreement setting forth an understanding concerning article III of the agricultural commodities agreement of April 16, 1957, as amended (TIAS 3817, 3904, 3918, 4135, and 4217). Effected by exchange of notes at Bogotá April 20, 1961. Entered into force April 20, 1961.

Agreement setting forth an understanding concerning article III of the agricultural commodities agreement of March 14, 1958, as amended (TIAS 4015, 4023, 4080, and 4136). Effected by exchange of notes at Bogotá April 20, 1961. Entered into force April 20, 1961.

Agreement amending the agricultural commodities agreement of October 6, 1959 (TIAS 4337). Effected by exchange of notes at Bogotá April 26, 1961. Entered into force April 26, 1961.

Germany

Agreement relating to the partial settlement of German debts to the United States resulting from postwar economic assistance (other than surplus property). Effected by exchange of notes at Bonn April 25, 1961. Entered into force April 25, 1961.

Liberia

Agreement extending the agreement of January 11, 1951 (TIAS 2171), for the assignment of a United States military mission to Liberia. Effected by exchange of notes at Monrovia April 19 and 24, 1961. Entered into force April 24, 1961, operative from January 11, 1960.

Pakistan

Agreement revising route annex to air transport agreement (TIAS 1586 and 3078). Effected by exchange of notes at Karachi March 28 and April 18, 1961. Entered into force April 18, 1961.

^a Not in force for the United States.

Yugoslavia

Agreement relating to a grant to Yugoslavia to assist in the acquisition of certain nuclear research and training equipment and materials. Effected by exchange of notes at Belgrade April 19, 1961. Entered into force April 19, 1961.

Check List of Department of State Press Releases: May 8-14

Press releases may be obtained from the Office of News, Department of State, Washington 25, D.C.

Releases issued prior to May 8 which appear in this issue of the BULLETIN are Nos. 206 of April 12, 273 of April 29, 279 and 281 of May 2, 289 of May 4, and 294 of May 6.

No.	Date	Subject
*293	5/8	U.S. participation in international conferences.
296	5/8	Investment guaranty agreement with Argentina.
297	5/8	Martin: "Trade and Aid in the Sixties."
†298	5/8	Foreign Relations volume.
*299	5/8	Cultural exchange (Somalia).
†300	5/8	Delegation to Inter-American Nuclear Energy Commission (rewrite).
†301	5/9	Visit of EEC Commission President.
302	5/9	Venezuelan financial mission.
†303	5/9	Amendments to program for visit of Tunisian President (rewrite).
304	5/10	Visit of Governor of Taiwan.
305	5/10	Guinea credentials (rewrite).
†306	5/10	U.S.-Tunisia economic communique.
307	5/10	NATO communique.
†308	5/12	Agreement with Canada on pilotage arrangements on Great Lakes and Seaway navigation (rewrite).
†309	5/11	Delegation to Conference of African States (rewrite).
*310	5/11	Williams: introduction of Tunisian President to Foreign Policy Association, New York.
*311	5/11	Fredericks designated Deputy Assistant Secretary for African Affairs (biographic details).
312	5/12	GATT convenes 18th session.
†313	5/12	Williams: "United States Policy Toward Africa and the United Nations."
314	5/12	Ball visit to Europe for talks with textile officials.
316	5/13	Technical cooperation agreement with Senegal.

* Not printed.

† Held for a later issue of the BULLETIN.

Africa. United States Sends Greetings to African Conference at Monrovia (Kennedy)	802	Food-for-Peace Council Members Named by President Kennedy	829
Agriculture. Food-for-Peace Council Members Named by President Kennedy	829	The United States and Revolution (Rowan)	795
American Republics		United States and Senegal Sign Technical Cooperation Agreement	833
Economic and Social Progress for Expanding Trade in the Americas (Berle)	818	North Atlantic Treaty Organization. North Atlantic Council Holds Ministerial Meeting at Oslo (Rusk, text of communique)	800
U.S., Argentine Presidents Exchange Views on Alliance for Progress (texts of letters)	814	Presidential Documents	
Argentina		President Announces Program To Aid U.S. Textile Industry	825
Argentine Government Ratifies Investment Guaranty Agreement	833	President Kennedy Congratulates New Prime Minister of Belgium	803
U.S., Argentine Presidents Exchange Views on Alliance for Progress (texts of letters)	814	United States Sends Greetings to African Conference at Monrovia	802
Belgium. President Kennedy Congratulates New Prime Minister of Belgium	803	U.S., Argentine Presidents Exchange Views on Alliance for Progress (texts of letters)	814
China. Governor of Taiwan Visits U.S.	803	Public Affairs	
Congress, The. Department Supports Revision of ITU Convention and Radio Regulations (Martin)	830	The United Nations and the Role of Citizen Organizations (Stevenson)	804
Economic Affairs		The United States and Revolution (Rowan)	795
Mr. Ball Visits Europe for Talks With Officials on Textile Matters	825	Senegal. United States and Senegal Sign Technical Cooperation Agreement	833
Certain Tariff Concessions Renegotiated by Japan	826	Treaty Information	
Department Supports Revision of ITU Convention and Radio Regulations (Martin)	830	Argentine Government Ratifies Investment Guaranty Agreement	833
Economic and Social Progress for Expanding Trade in the Americas (Berle)	818	Current Treaty Actions	833
GATT Contracting Parties Convene at Geneva for 18th Session	832	Department Supports Revision of ITU Convention and Radio Regulations (Martin)	830
President Announces Program To Aid U.S. Textile Industry	825	United States and Senegal Sign Technical Cooperation Agreement	833
Trade and Aid in the Sixties (Martin)	822	U.S.S.R. The Man Who Wasn't There (Cleveland)	808
Venezuelan Financial Mission	821	United Nations	
Educational and Cultural Affairs. Governor of Taiwan Visits U.S.	803	The Man Who Wasn't There (Cleveland)	808
Europe. Mr. Ball Visits Europe for Talks With Officials on Textile Matters	825	The United Nations and the Role of Citizen Organizations (Stevenson)	804
Guinea. Letters of Credence (Conté)	802	Venezuela. Venezuelan Financial Mission	821
International Organizations and Conferences			
Certain Tariff Concessions Renegotiated by Japan	826		
Department Supports Revision of ITU Convention and Radio Regulations (Martin)	830		
GATT Contracting Parties Convene at Geneva for 18th Session	832		
Japan. Certain Tariff Concessions Renegotiated by Japan	826		
Mutual Security			
Argentine Government Ratifies Investment Guaranty Agreement	833		

Name Index

Berle, Adolf A	818
Cleveland, Harlan	808
Conté, Seydou	802
Frondizi, Arturo	815
Kennedy, President	802, 803, 814, 825
Martin, Edwin M	822, 830
Rowan, Carl T	795
Rusk, Secretary	800
Stevenson, Adlai E	804

UNIVERSITY MICROFILMS INC
EDITORIAL DEPT
313 N FIRST ST
ANN ARBOR, MICH
DSB-DEC

UNITED STATES
GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
DIVISION OF PUBLIC DOCUMENTS
WASHINGTON 25, D.C.

PENALTY FOR PRIVATE USE TO AVOID
PAYMENT OF POSTAGE, \$300
(GPO)

OFFICIAL BUSINESS



the
Department
of
State

*Foreign Relations of the
United States*

THE CONFERENCE OF BERLIN
(The Potsdam Conference)
1945

The Department of State recently released a two-volume documentary compilation on the Potsdam Conference of 1945. The first of the two volumes is devoted exclusively to pre-conference papers dealing with the background of the Conference, while volume II contains the United States minutes of the Conference, Conference documents (including an annotated text of the Protocol of Proceedings), and supplementary papers.

The volumes deal with a wide range of subject matter, since the conferees were discussing problems of occupation, reconstruction, and peace-making in Europe, on the one hand, and problems of prosecuting the war against Japan, on the other. Among European questions, problems relating to Germany, Poland, Austria, and the Balkans contribute most of the bulk of the documentation. There are also included papers relating to China, Iran, Lebanon, Syria, Palestine, Tangier, and Turkey.

Publication 7015—Vol. I
Publication 7163—Vol. II

Price: \$6.00
Price: \$6.50

Order Form

To: Supt. of Documents
Govt. Printing Office
Washington 25, D.C.

Enclosed find:

\$ _____
(cash, check, or money
order payable to
Supt. of Docs.)

Please send me _____ copies of—

*Foreign Relations of the United States: The Conference of Berlin (The
Potsdam Conference), 1945.*

Name: _____

Street Address: _____

City, Zone, and State: _____

